HUMANISM in The Nikāya Literature

Bhikkhu DUC TRUONG

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

Over 2500 years ago when the world overwhelming in the dark times of mystery and the wrong view on man, Buddhist humanism emerged and brought the light of enlightenment to humankind. It emancipated man from the concept of Great *Brahmā*, the Supreme, the Omnipotent (*abhibhū anabhibhūto*), the Creator (*nimmāta*), God (*issaro*) and the view that all beings are His creation... at His Will all beings come into existence, or man is their production.

As a humanist, the Buddha revolutionized thoughts and traditions of ancient India. He looked upon man's wayfaring in the world as a very true thing. He urged man to put forth his own energy to attain the unattained, to master the un-mastered and to realize the unrealized, and that in possession of that state man would live happily.

Buddhist humanism considers man's position is supreme. Man is his own master and there is no other being or power higher than himself judging over his destiny; his success or failure lies in his own will, choice and strength.

In the book dealt with 'Humanism in the *Nikāya* literature' including of seven chapters. It begins with the general introduct-ion of what are the meanings of humanism and what are the teachings of Buddha in the *Nikāya* literature or Early Buddhist literature.

ISBN : 81-7854-065-7 Price : 650.00

HUMANISM

IN

THE NIKĀYA LITERATURE

Bhikkhu Duc Truong

Eastern Book Linkers

DELHI : : (INDIA)

Published by
EASTERN BOOK LINKERS
5825, New Chandrawal,
Jawahar Nagar, Delhi-7
Ph. : 23850287, 30919869
e-mail : ebl@vsnl.net

First Edition : 2005

Price : 650.00

ISBN : 81-7854-065-7

Humanism in The Nikāya Literature by *Bhikkhu Duc Truong*

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Publisher.

Type Setting by Creative Graphics, Delhi
Printed at : R. K. Offset Process, Delhi-32

PREFACE

Over 2500 years ago when the world overwhelming in the dark times of mystery and the wrong view on man, Buddhist humanism emerged and brought the light of enlightenment to humankind. It emancipated man from the concept of Great *Brahmā*, the Supreme, the Omnipotent (*abhibhū anabhibhūto*), the Creator (*nimmāta*), God (*issaro*) and the view that all beings are His creation... at His Will all beings come into existence,[1] or man is their production.

As a humanist, the Buddha revolutionized thoughts and traditions of ancient India. He looked upon man's wayfaring in the world as a very true thing. He urged man to put forth his own energy to attain the unattained, to master the unmastered and to realize the unrealized, and that in possession of that state man would live happily.[2]

To respect, Buddhist humanism considers man's position is supreme. Man is his own master and there is no other being or power higher than himself judging over his destiny; his success or failure lies in his own will, choice and strength. 'To become a friend, an intimate of that which is good and righteous...you yourself must take into your life diligence in good things.'[3] Human life, or more properly human conditions, is of supreme value, not only because of life itself but also because of the fact that human welfare, material, moral and spiritual, and even final emancipation are gained from it and in it.[4]

Here I have dealt with 'Humanism in the *Nikāya* literature' including of seven chapters. It begins with the

general introduction of what are the meanings of humanism and what are the teachings of Buddha in the *Nikāya* literature or Early Buddhist literature. In chapter two it mentions to the eight as based on epistemology. With these kinds of knowledge man can understand profoundly phenomenon things as what they are (see in chapter three: the perspective of existence). The relationship man to man in society is built on structure of equality, democracy and freedom (chapter four: the social structure). For maintaining this social structure and emancipating mind from the defilements each man has to consider to practice moral conduct (*sīla*), as well developing concentration (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*paññā*) as the way of life (see in chapter five: the transcendence of ethic).

Furthermore, Buddhist humanism expresses the peaceful attitude to humankind through the thought of non-violence (*āhiṁsa*), no-self or egolessness (*anattā*) as well the dimension of harmony and peace as loving-kindness (*mettā*), compassion (*karuṇā*), sympathetic joy (*muditā*) and equanimity (*upekkhā*),[5] as well as patience (*khanti*), tolerance (*adhivāsanā*), humility (*nihatamāna*), contentment (*santuṭṭhi*) and charity (*dayā*) (see in chapter six: attitude to peace).

Lastly, in the chapter conclusion it emphasizes to the Ultimate goal of Buddhist humanism is the attaining of *Nibbāna* which highest state of Epistemology, Existence, Social structure, Ethic, and Peace. That is the path of life and the liberation of mind from all ills, sorrow and suffering by emphasizing the need of the destruction of all egoism, the abandonment of selfish cravings, the ejection of all eagerness of sensuous desire.

The object of the proposed thesis is the Humanism, which has been mentioned in *Nikāya* literature through the teachings of Buddha. It is the main source of my research work following the latter, which is known as the earliest

source in *Pāli*, English. In addition to that, several Buddhist works write by Buddhist and Non-Buddhist scholars also will be consulted for the further development of the thesis.

For successfully completing the work, with all my heart, I wish to express my deep thanks to the Indian Council for Culture Relations and the Viet Nam Ministry of Education, who granted me the scholarship for my study in India.

I also would like to thanks:

- Most Ven. Thich Minh Chau, Most Ven. Thich Tri Quang, and Ven. Thich Hue Xuong who are my teacher, my spiritual leader for always being a profound source of encouragement and support to me.

- My Supervisors Dr. I.N. Singh of the Department of Buddhist Studies and Dr. B.S. Rastogi of the Department of Sanskrit, who supervised my work and guided me to complete my thesis for the Ph. D degrees of the University of Delhi.

- Ven. Thich Thai Sieu, Ven. Thich Thi Qua, Ven. Thich Giac Tin, Ven. Thich Hanh Chanh, who gave me wonderful ideals to improve my work, who helped me in colleting materials, who willingly lend a helping hand during the time my study in India.

- The Readers and Lectures of the Department of Buddhist Studies, who gave me knowledge in the course of MA; as well the staff of Delhi University Library who provided me with most of the research material.

- Lastly, I wish to express my deep gratitude to my friends and members of family, who gave countenance to me completing this thesis.

May the Buddha bless all beings. *Sabbe bhavantu sukhino.*

Delhi University
April 4th 2003

Rev. TRAN THANH CHUONG

References

1. D. I, p. 18.
2. A. III, p. 103 ff.
3. S. I, p. 75.
4. S. III, p. 235 f.
5. D. III, pp. 196, 220.

CONTENT

Preface *(iii)*

Abbreviations *(xi)*

1. INTRODUCTION 1

A. What is Humanism? 1

I. The meaning of Humanism 1

1. The evolutionary process of humanism 1

2. The definition of humanism 10

II. The derivation of Buddhist humanism 14

B. The establishment of Nikāya Literature 15

I. Who is Buddha 15

II. The teaching of Buddha 19

III. Source and date of *Nikāya* literature 33

2. DOCTRINE OF EPISTEMOLOGY **40**

A. The Significance of Epistemology 40

B. Epistemological Atittude 43

I. Authority 43

II. Faith 51

III. Reason 58

IV. Analysis 63

V. Logic and Truth 72

C. Epistemological Empiricism 74

3. THE PERSPECTIVE OF EXIXTENCE **90**

A. The world of flux 90

I. The Existential Nature of World 90

II. Objections on Psychological Grounds 99

1. Citta (consciousness) 100

2. Cetasika (factor of consciousness) 104

3. Rūpa (form) 111

B. Nature of man 113

I. Reality of Suffering 113

II. The Cause of Suffering 116

C. The Path Cessation of Suffering 123

I. The Path of Four Noble Truths 123

II. The Noble Eightfold Path 126

III. Sublime State of Mind 129

4. THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE 139

A. Equality 139

I. Castes in Society 139

II. Human Right 147

III. Women's Position 158

B. The Democracy 163

C. Freedom 172

5. THE TRANSCENDENCE OF ETHICS 189

A. The Significance and Source of Ethics 189

I. Introduction of Ethics 189

II. The significance of Ethics 192

III. Source of Ethics 199

B. Ethic Education 204

I. Ethic Conduct 204

II. Social Morality 209
C. The Efficacy of Ethics 221
I. Training of Mind 221
II. The Attainment of Insight 226
6. ATTITUDE TO PEACE 242
A. The Thought of Ahimsa (Non-Violent) 242
I. Towards Animal 242
II. Towards Human Beings 247
B. The Dimension of Harmony 259
I. The ideology of Egolessness (no-self) 259
II. Harmonious Opinion 267
C. Peaceful World 273
I. Peace towards Human World 273
II. Peace in Mental Calm 284
7. CONCLUSION **297**
A. Ultimate Goal 297
B. The Opinion of Experience 311
C. The Course of Development 317
Bibliography *327*

Abbreviations

A.	Aṅguttara Nikāya
AA.	Comy. on A.
Abhs.	Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha
Brh.	Brhadāraṇyaka Upanishad
Comy.	Commentary
Cull.	Cullavagga
D.	Dīgha Nikāya
DA.	Comy. on Dīgha Nikāya
Dhp.	Dhammapada
DhpA.	Comy. on Dhp.
Dhs.	Dhammasaṅgaṇi
DhsA.	Dhs. Aṭṭhakathā
Dial.	Dialogues of the Buddha
D.O.P.	Dictionary of Philosopher
D.P.P.N.	Dictionary Pali Proper Names
E.B.	Encyclopedia Britannica
E.O.B.	Encyclopedia of Buddhism
E.O.R.	Encyclopedia of Religion
E.O.R.E	Ency. of Religion and Ethics
E.O.P.	Encyclopedia of Philosophy
E.P.D.	English-Pāli Dictionary
I.E.O.B.	International Ency. of Buddhism
Iti.	Itivuttaka
J.	Jātaka
JA.	Comy. on Jātaka
KhA.	Comy. on Kh.
KS.	Kindred Sayings
Kvu.	Kathāvaṭṭhu

M.	Majjhima Nikāya
MA.	Comy. on M.
Mhvg.	Mahāvagga
Miln.	Milinda-pañha
MLS.	Middle Length Sayings
Nd. I.	Cullaniddesa
Nd. II.	Mahāniddesa
Nett.	Netti-pakaraṇa
P.	Page
P.E.D.	Pāli-English Dictionary
Pv.	Petavatthu
S.	Saṁyutta Nikāya
S.B.B.	Sacred Book of the Buddhism
Sn.	Sutta-Nipāta
Thera.	Theragāthā
Their.	Therigāthā
Ud.	Udāna
V.	Verse
Ven.	Venerable
Vibht.	Vibhāvinitikā
Vism.	Visuddhimagga
Vin.	Vinaya
W.B.E.	The World Book Encyclopedia

1
Introduction

WHAT IS HUMANISM?

The Meaning of Humanism

The evolutionary process of Humanism

The fountainhead of humanism date back to the ancient age and exerting its impact on man and society, it has now come to as the heading of forefront in modern time. According to Humanistic philosophers, humanism originated from the Latin *humanitas* (*paideia* and *philanthropia* combined). It is implying ontological individualism and the guest for the perfection of the human spirit through the consummation of man's inherent potentialities is subjectivist and optimistic in its orientation.[1] The term 'humanism' could be explained as a single word, which expresses briefly the intellectual ideals of the renaissance. Broadly speaking humanism emphasized the capability of man to control his own fate and to achieve a happier state. However it is obvious that the humanists of the renaissance believed highly of the nobility and potentialities of man.

This was a period of stagnation for Occidental civilization and has been rightly referred to as the Dark Ages. Humanism laid the important role in the realm of individual human action, and so the hold that their gods and myths had exercised gradually diminished. Classical Greece hosted,

in the 5th century BC, an almost miraculous flowering of the arts, most notably in sculptural representation of the human form; at the same time Athenian democracy flourishing under the even hand of Pericles (495-429 BC) were radically egalitarian, but also the cause of the instability and warfare that finally ended the Golden Age of Greece.

However, Greek humanism continued to stand for the Mediterranean culture of the ancient world right up to the end of the Roman Empire. In the 5th century AD after the Roman Empire collapsed, Europe in time found a new source of unity in Christianity - a religion that had at its core a humanistic vision of the nobility and dignity of humankind as created by God. But the medieval Christian view held that humankind was a community underpinned by theology and the ecclesiastical system. In other hand, humanity depends on common destiny, which is decided by the Church.

This view brought about the explosion during the Renaissance, with the revival of concentration in the non-Christian Greek and Latin literature of the classical world. Renaissance humanism is opposed to credit denominationalism and theological orthodoxy or ecclesiastical fanaticism. As people rediscovered classical humanism, the individual came to be seen once again as a free agent. The Italian renaissance humanist Picodella Mirandola (1463-1494) emphasized that humankind's dignity was the supreme value, and humanity's place was indisputably at the center of the world. Humanism was revived after the long time to lose consciousness in the 14th century in Italy and spread to other European countries.

The Renaissance humanist thought that education in the liberal arts; particularly classical Greek literature would help the development of a responsible individual and revive the spirit of freedom, which had been lost in the middle Ages.[2] Renaissance humanism led people to see themselves

as creative beings, not only independent of nature but also capable of altering and reorganizing it. The most significance of the renaissance is the acceleration of the process of technological invention and development, a process, which has now advanced to become the dominant force in determining and changing the world.

The gust of wind of Renaissance inspired to European thinkers, humanistic ideas appeared and developed in many the works. For example, the British philosopher Hobbes (1588-1679) argued for the legitimate rights of the individual and the basis of moral values as the common good and not an absolute or supernatural standard. Lessing, (1729-1781) and Herder (1744-1803) resemble a part the opinion of the German enlightenment Rousseau (1712-1778), who begins his Social Contract with the words, 'Man is born free; and anywhere he is in chains.' Kant's (1724-1804) epistemology brings man to the center of knowledge, and his ethics stressed the view that man should not do unto others what one does not desire done to oneself.[3] The leaders of the French enlightenment of the 18th century emphasized man as part of nature and no mystery but that he is the highest value. They emphasized the contention that the existing social, political and belief system deprived man of his birthright to individual freedom, happiness and pleasure. This is an affect amount to saying that one should not cause suffering to others.

Humanism reaches its heights in the time of Renaissance from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century when it became a movement against Feudalism and medieval theology of Christianity and Paganism in the West, which ignored the legitimate interest of the common man. The effort of Renaissance Humanist is found as an integral part of it, a sense of freedom and broken the fetters in which medieval the Church, the Empire and the Feudal Lords imposed their dominations on men as the guardians of the

order. However, the early humanists were not anti-religion or anti-Christian but considered that the Scriptures admitted the necessity for earthly happiness of man and the value of man's work and his success in this life. The eighteenth century enlightenment headed by Voltaire, Diderot, and the other encyclopedic has also heralded a similar point of view. Patanjali, Hemacandra have also strengthened similar point of view through their literary achievements and personality. It put forward the slogan of liberty, equality and fraternity and stood for man's right freely to develop his natural talent and potentially.

Humanism progressed from this early start and by the nineteenth century was able to adopt a secular form completely freed from the Christian religion and indeed combating the principal dogmas of this religion. It was greatly assisted in this by the growth of science both in the physical and biological areas. Early scientists like Galileo had indeed realized the conflict between the discoveries of science and Christian teaching. For this the Church often persecuted them. It was the triumph of Darwinism in the nineteenth century that for many humanists clinched the issue between theistic religion and science.

Humanism also helped the Renaissance scholars to go away from tradition of Scholasticism and Aristotelianism, have ceased to ties with traditional religion well as. Some forms of science are completely value-neutral and are not concerned with evolving a system of ethical norms that should govern human conduct. Rationalism, which many associate with humanism, is concerned primarily with the methodology of deriving valid propositions and is somewhat different from humanism. Skepticism, another trend usually associated with Humanism, is concerned with refuting claims relating to supernatural or supernormal abilities. Regarding to this, by reviving the doctrines of Greeks like

those of modern science, in turn, had much impact on the paths along which humanism flowed and evolved later on.

Humanism were breaking away from a myth-based view of the world and thinking of any superhuman agencies play a direct or indirect role in human life, which upholds the dignity, value of man and considers welfare of all human activity. Humanism gives the greatest emphasis to, and places the greatest value on, humankind. It is argued that man is the one and only being on earth that is capable of knowing to control his own fate and to achieve a happier state. It is obvious that the humanists of the renaissance believed highly of the nobility and potentialities of man. It incorporates the fundamental questions of universe concerning humanity with the will to strive for individual perfection - as well as for the improvement of society.

The attributes of humanism is considered of what could be called a "scientific attitude", respecting the autonomy of the human being and human experience as the only final arbiter. Further, humanist way of life, contrasted with blind faith in religion, came into prominence. In the words it was called 'natural philosophy' according to which people live a life governed by the light of reason. It is adverse "supernatural philosophy', according to which one lives by faith in god as religious authority dictates.

Humanism as an outlook and a philosophy has continued in the increase activities spearheaded by the United Nations Organization, like the Human Rights Movement, Freedom from Hunger Movement, Women's Liberation Movement, the movement against discrimination on the basis of race color, sex etc. Besides, humanist's emphasis on improvement of universal education spread of science and technology may be considered as attempts the spirit of humanism in the political and social sphere.

The heading liberal democracies of humanism almost

cannot lack in the developed or developing countries. "Humanism is one of the vital religionsIt is the dominant religion of our time, a part of the lives of nearly everyone in the "developed" world" writes David Ehrenfeld. He also says, "Humanism is at the heart of our present world culture."[4] Further the spirit of humanistic philosophy is implicit in the activity of polity, society, culture, education, etc.

From the Renaissance onwards, some thinkers as the British scholar statesman Thomas More (1478-1535), Italian philosopher Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639) and French philosopher Francois Fourier (1772-1837) who have been interested in the encumbrance of the common man conceived the idea that justice and happiness could be achieved only by the abolition of private property. Therefore Marxism put forth the form of communism accepts the labor theory as the existing of the human being. It was developed by Karl Marx, Friedrich Engles and later, by Lenin (1870-1924).[5] Marxists maintain that Marx's view of freedom as created by activity creating 'all-round development and flowering of human energy as the end in itself of the future communist society'[6] exemplify his humanism even in his later works.

Pragmatism[7] too is concerned with humanism through version of empiricism based on the work of American, William James who was both a psychologist and a philosopher during the past century. The philosophy outlined by James is humanistic in the sense that (human) experience is its means as well as end.

The philosophy of F.C.S. Schiller (1864-1937) is called humanism and although it is also sometimes referred to as 'personal idealism' it is similar to James's pragmatism. Schiller wrote that humanism admits, "every hypothesis as worth trying which has a human interest and appeals to any side of human nature."[8] He considers humanism as "a natural

and logical development of pragmatic method in testing knowledge by its human value" (loc. cit.). Schiller marks that philosophic and literary versions of humanism have a common basis related to human purposes. He say, "Byputting man into the center of the intellectual universe and giving all science and literature a reference to human life and its purposes the philosophy connects with literary humanism" (loc. cit.).

Thinker Kierkegaard's (1813-1855) emphasizes in his work that Existentialism mentioned the concrete situation of man as its major. It was also an endeavor to deal with the subsistence of human condition in a world in which traditional religion was losing significance and influence, the external ritualism of religions leaves it cold as another existentialist philosopher, Nietzsche, (1844-1900) announced with his statement, "God is dead." Jean Paul Satre also writes, "Existentialism is nothing else but an attempt to draw the full conclusion from a consistently atheistic position."[9]

Existentialism draws interest to individuality's freedom of man and emphasizes that action of man is crucial significance to his fate, which has no any external authority or revelation to intervene in. These characteristics could also be considered as a reaction against rational right of man together with science and technology.

In existentialism two forms of the atheistic and theistic is continuation together as duplicity of the existence. Jean Paul Satre, atheistic existentialist rejects existentialist humanism as a cult when he writes, " The word humanism has two very different meanings. One may understand by humanism a theory, which upholds man as the end in it and as the supreme value"[10] According to Satre the sense of existential humanism in the terms. '. It is in projecting and losing himself beyond himself' [11] that man makes himself to exist. 'There is no universe except universe, the universe of

the human subjectivity. This relation of transcendence as constitutive of man with subjectivityit is this that we call existential humanism. This is humanism, because we remind man that there is no legislator but himself"[12]

While Gabriel Marcel, theistic existentialist is in the view one sees the existentialistic and humanistic ideals of love, fraternity and freedom that writes, "The freest man is also the most fraternal. The fraternal man is linked to his neighbor. The fraternal man is somehow enriched by everything, which enriches his brotherwhat are fraternity if not refusal of all forms of segregation? Again: fraternity implies dynamism, which is in fact that of love"[13]

It has a great significance in setting forth Humanist Manifesto I (1933) and Humanist Manifesto II (1973). It is a product of many minds that recognized as platform to develop of humanism. As Corliss Lamont wrote "I believe that the Humanist Manifesto of 1933 was a landmark in the development of religious and philosophical Humanism, It is an historical document of great worth and importance in the Humanist movement and must be included as vital source material in any careful study of modern Humanism."[14]

Humanism could appear in two strains, which seem adversative in contrast: one regarded with science, technology, materialism; the other a more humanitarian, spiritual and ethical tendency of humanism some times with oblique appearance of religion (e.g., theistic existentialism). Here pertinent questions arise viz.-should humanism be inspired by science or by religion? Dr. Radhakrishnan has his own answer "There is no conflict between religion and a reasonable humanism because when the humanist admits the intimateness of the values he is implicitly accepting the spiritual view of the universe."[15] A scholar says, however, solution lies in the resolution of the conflict between religion

and science in the first instance. Julian Huxley suggested "the only way in which the present split between religion and science could be mended would be through the acceptance by science of the fact and the value of religions must evolve if they are not to become extinct or at best into outdated living fossils struggling to survive in a new and alien environment."[16] Wazir Singh said, "Humanism is not different from religion or a set of beliefs supported by an emotional attitude. People hold on to a dogma in spite of intellectual evidence conflicting with their faith because the faith makes a powerful appeal to their passion."[17]

Here, it is recognized there is a marked difference between Eastern and Western streams of thought on the subject of nature. In the past, people in the West have tended to regard humanity as being in some way superior to nature, and even as owning nature. (This is a legacy of Renaissance humanism: medieval ideas were closer to Oriental ones.) In contrast, the traditional Oriental view is that humanity is a part of nature, and in no way in rivalry with it. Oriental humanism may be said that originated spontaneously in popular struggles against social suppression, crude vulgarity, socially deviant behavior, slavery and the exploitation in ancient China. To modern time, there are some the historic events as the republic revolution subverted the long-standing domination of many dynasty of feudal system in 1912 in China; Vietnam changed vigorously from feudal system to establish republic democracy, after driving off English and French militarism in 1945 in North Vietnam; or as India became independent nation in 1949 when English Monarchy gave back legal right.

Ideological movement of humanism developed profoundly in the form of religion as Confucianism, Taoism in China; Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism in India. However, Buddhism goes beyond most of these other religions in that

it is positively anti-theistic because the very notion of God conflicts with some principles which are fundamental to the Buddhist humanism view of the world and the role of humans in it. Succor and guidance and the non-theistic base of Buddhism, enables it to confine itself only to mankind in the actual world, depending upon right knowledge and code of morals and also at the same time, the social harmony and balance.

The Definition of Humanism

Looking for a definition on the theme 'Humanism', in fact, it is discussed excitingly among of Scholars. Such as French Encyclopedists came forward to humanize Western philosophy, later in the 18th century AD, E. Baker wrote, this new philosophical tradition was able to change and improve the concept of human rights and relevant ideas as illustrated by the new definitions to them.[18] In the Dictionary of Philosopher the word 'humanism' is the definition ' any moral or social program that seeks to increase welfare and decrease suffering of human beings.'[19] In Encyclopedia of Philosophy according to F.C.S. Schiller, a pragmatic expounder of Western humanism defines the word as 'it recognizes and enthrones the value of man and makes him 'the measure of all things' taking human nature and interests as its main theme.[20] Meanwhile a modern social philosopher describes humanism more exclusively as, " we can say that humanism implies any view that evaluates humanity and represents a shared quest for the good life of mankind, that recognizes man as the measure of all things by exalting and enthroning his human will, effort, dignity privilege, prestige and freedom, especially in the sense of responsibility for his own fate and destiny, any view that centralizes interest in human welfare and well-being "[21]

Vishwanath Prasad Verma is claimed humanism holds

that through interactions with explorations into and encounter with response generation objects personality is built and solidified in place of over-stressing formal disquisitions it is more inspired by the depth of authentic inner experience.[22] Jaideep Singh has stressed the term Humanism does not stand for a single well-defined concept. It has meant different things in different periods of man's cultural history; it has also meant and continues to mean different things to writers and thinkers of diverse persuasions. It seems that man's drive for higher and more perfect that has been traditionally associated with religion cannot be assimilated wholly to be needs and responses of his biosocial constitution or existence. The religions mode of experience, it seems involves in its totality man's aesthetic and contemplative nature. On one side and his vital imagination response on the other side the religions way of life, of consciousness and response, seems to be bound up with man's creative imaginative nature which religion.[23] Dr. Jatava considers "humanism as a philosophy and movement is based on respect for the dignity of man concern for his welfare, his all-round development and the creation of favorable conditions for a just social life."[24] In the book 'Buddhism and Marxism' of Banerjee that definition of humanism as the doctrine which is exclusively concerned with human interests is, of course, too vague to give any clear indication of its specific aim. In order to determine this aim it may, then, be useful to refer to the religion of God to which it is opposed.[25]

Humanism sometimes is summed as Tagore's religion of man, Corliss Lamont's philosophy human being, V.M. Tarakundey's Radical Humanism yet other can call it as spiritual humanism, scientific humanism, secular humanism, naturalistic humanism and democratic etc. It can say that the definition of Humanism is given in the many different aspects as Corliss Lamont has his own way to quote:

"Humanism is much faceted philosophy, congenial to this modern age, got fully aware of the lessons of history and the richness of philosophic tradition. Its task is to organize into a consistent and into eligible whole the chief elements of philosophic truth and to make that synthesis a powerful force and reality in the minds and action of living men. What then are the basic principles of humanism that define its position and distinguish it from other philosophical viewpoints? There are ten central propositions in the Humanist philosophy."[26] The American Humanist Association defined that humanism is a democratic and ethical life stance, which affirms that human beings have the right and responsibility to give meaning, and shape to their own lives. It stands for the building of a more humane society through an ethics based on human and other natural values in a spirit of reason and free inquiry through human capability. It is not theistic, and it does not accept supernatural views of reality. In Encyclopedia Britannica, humanism is an attitude of mind attaching prime importance to man and human values often regarded as the central theme of Renaissance civilization.[27] The world Book Encyclopedia, humanism is a way of looking at our world which emphasizes the importance of human beings their nature and their place in the universe.[28]

It says that the word 'humanism' has a number of meanings and because authors and speakers trying to explain humanism only among of the aspects of humankind. In each aspect, the meaning of the word constitutes a different type of humanism. But all humanists agree that people are the center of their study. Frederick Edwords[29] summarizes the different varieties of humanism as following:

Literary Humanism is a devotion to the humanities or literary culture.

Renaissance Humanism is the spirit of learning that developed at the end of the Middle Ages with the revival of

classical letters and a renewed confidence in the ability of human beings to determine for themselves truth and falsehood.

Cultural Humanism is the rational and empirical tradition that originated largely in ancient Greece and Rome, evolved throughout European history, and now constitutes a basic part of the western approach to science, political theory, ethics and law.

Philosophical Humanism is any outlook or way of life centered on human need and interest. Sub-categories of this type include Christian Humanism and Modern Humanism.

Christian Humanism is defined by Webster's Third new International Dictionary as 'a philosophy advocating the self-fulfillment of man within the framework of Christian principles.' This more human-oriented faith is largely a product of the Renaissance and is a part of what made up Renaissance humanism.

Modern Humanism, also called Naturalistic Humanism, Scientific Humanism, Ethical Humanism and Democratic Humanism is defined by one of its leading proponents, Corliss Lamont, as 'a naturalistic philosophy that rejects all supernaturalism and relies primarily upon reason and science, democracy and human compassion.' Modern Humanism has a dual origin, both secular and religious, and these constitute its sub-categories.

Secular Humanism is an outgrowth of 18th century enlightenment rationalism and 19th century free thought. Many secular groups, such as the Council for Democratic and Secular Humanism and the American Rationalist Federation, and many otherwise unaffiliated academic philosophers and scientists, advocate this philosophy.

Religious Humanism emerged out of Ethical Culture, Unitarianism, and Universalism. Today, many Unitarian

Universalistic congregations and Ethical Culture societies describe themselves as humanist in the modern sense. Religious Humanism is usually without a God, without a belief in the supernatural, without a belief in an after life, and without a belief in a 'higher' source of moral values.

Buddhist humanism, however, cannot find any position in the classification of Frederick Edwords, as well as those almost of scholars. Regarding human interest and benefit, some scholars or thinkers, however, said that all religious humanism is essentially the same and there are no significant differences the only difference is in the interpretation and practice. Does Buddhist humanism share this viewpoint? To answer this question it has to examine with scientist attitude what is meant by significant feature that Buddhism has which other religious humanism do not have.

Here, a **definition to Buddhist humanism** it is suggested that is a philosophical thought, a doctrine on attitude concerned primarily with human beings and their values, capacities and achievements that direct towards humankind to highest happiness of *Nibbāna*.

Derivation of Buddhist humanism

Buddhist humanism is began which flourished in 600 years B.C in the context of ancient India where had been many religious and thoughtful scholars. All of what the activities of Buddhist humanism aims at serving the profit, welfare and happiness of mankind, as well all beings. In other words, Buddhist humanism is not only to discuss the meaning and character of humanism in the light of Buddhism but also to do a study ultimate way of freedom of man from all sufferings.

It is asserted that the teachings of Buddhist humanism have not come down from heaven, from omniscient God or to be the vehicle of a revealed Scripture. It has grown out of

social existence of mankind to satisfy the needs of man. Buddhist humanism takes human beings as the prime point of focus and solves the human problems not by any grace of god, by efforts of man himself. It believes that human beings have power or potentiality of solving their own problems. And in solving their problems they rely mainly on reason and scientific method applied with courage and vision. Buddhist humanism is contrary to universal predestination, determinism or fatalism. It believes in creative choice and action and says that human beings are their own destiny.

The word 'humanism' in Buddhism derived from the term *Pāli mānusikatta* [30] that concerning with the human being without any external divine authority who stands in a superior position to man. It views the state as existing to serve the people, not the other way around. This is contrast to authoritarian or dictatorial states, where the individual is persecuted, disrespected and curtailed.

Buddhist humanism directs attention to the human being and the inner life of the human. By encouraging people to look within their own mind, those help people take responsibility for themselves and their environments. It is hoped that if human beings can channel 'negative' emotions such as greed and anger in a positive direction, then the world peace movement has a prime starting point firmly grounded in the lives of people. Buddhist humanism is focusing on the individual human life. People are encouraged to take responsibility for creating a harmonious inner life and for effecting positive change in the wider community.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NIKĀYA LITERATURE

Who is Buddha?

Sometime during the sixth century BC a solitary,

wandering ascetic sat to meditate beneath a shady tree, resolving not to rise until he had attained the ultimate knowledge of spiritual enlightenment. Thus began Buddhism, one of the world's great religions.

Historians, religious scholars, and various Buddhist sects debate the actual year of the Buddha's birth; it may have been as early as 644-540 BC. It is however, relatively certain that he was born Prince Gotama Siddhartha, the son of Suddhodana, king of the *Shakya* tribe. His birthplace was the forest grove of *Lumbini* in the hilly regions of what is today northeastern India and Nepal. Miraculous events surrounded his birth. Sages prophesied that he would become either a powerful king or, renouncing his royal life, an enlightened being and religious leader. King Suddhodhana did everything in his power to prevent the Prince from seeing the true nature of life, sought to insulate his son from religious and philosophical concerns by surrounding him with a life of ease and plenty. Ensconced within palace walls, the prince grew to manhood and fatherhood never having seen old age, sickness, poverty, or death. Yet this blindness to the full range of human experience was not to last. One day the prince ventured beyond the castle walls and, witnessing the inevitable sufferings of human existence, recognized the shallowness of his pampered life. Questions filled his thoughts; he stared to think very deeply why living beings suffer in this world. What is the cause of sufferings derived from sickness, old age and death? One day while he was setting under the tree as a young, he saw a snake suddenly appear and catch a frog. As the snake and the frog were struggling, an eagle swooped down from the sky and took away the snake with the frog still in its mouth. That incident was the turning point for the young prince to renounce the worldly life. He began to think about how living beings on the earth survive by preying on each other. One life form tries to grab and the

other tries to escape and this eternal battle continue as long as the world exists. This never-ending process of hunting and self-preservation is the basis of our unhappiness. It is the source of all suffering the Prince decided that he would discover the true path of spirituality to end this suffering. Thus at the age of twenty-nine, he renounced his life as a prince and ran away from the palace, let go the constraints of family and worldly responsibility to tread the path of self-discovery.

Siddhartha studied under various spiritual teachers, or gurus. Inquiring of their knowledge, he diligently practiced various *yoga* and meditations and learnt everything they had to teach but was unable to discover how to end suffering. Seven years passed in extreme asceticism, yet still he had not achieved his goal of enlightenment. He identified that undertaking the religious trip of asceticism was also not the way to overcome our pain, our suffering and causes of suffering. Finally, he renounced the path of asceticism. In other words, he renounced the path of religious fanaticism. He found the "middle way", the path that does not fall into two extremes, pleasure and self-mortification. Siddhartha journeyed toward the ancient sacred forests of *Uruvela* (modern *Gaya* in Bihar, in north India) with the intention of finally and completely realizing the infinite. Guided by visionary dreams and following in the footsteps of *Krakucchanda, Kanakamuni,* and *Kasyapa,* the Buddhas of three previous ages, Siddhartha sat beneath a beautiful tree called a '*Bodhi*' tree. Touching the earth, thereby calling it to witness the countless lifetimes of virtue that had led him to this place of enlightenment, he entered into a state of deep meditation. Forty-nine days and nights passed and his intention was realized. He was peacefully resting his mind, exploring further and further the nature of mind, the nature of suffering, the pain that he was going through in his mind, and the calmness that he was experiencing through his

meditative spiritual journey. Siddhartha became the Buddha, meaning the 'Enlightened One' or 'Awakened One.'

The Buddha spent the next seven weeks in meditation near the *Bodhi* Tree. Then, at the request of the god *Indra*, he began to speak of the great truth he had realized. His first sermon was given at *Isipatana* (modern *Sarnath* near *Banaras*). This first discourse, often called 'Setting in Motion of the Wheel of Truth' presented the Four Noble Truths and the Noble Eightfold Path for which Buddhism is so famous. (The Four Noble Truths assert that human beings suffer because of the clinging nature of the mind. There is a way out of this suffering, however, and that is through the meditative practices of the Noble Eightfold Path. Through these practices an individual gains insight into how his or her suffering is caused by identification with the mind's processes. Letting go of such identification, one discovers and increasingly resides in a pre-existing state of inner peace).

The Buddha spent the remainder of his life traveling around northeastern India teaching and establishing monastic communities for both men and women. He died at the age of eighty in the village of *Kusinara* (*modern Kushinager, Uttar Pradesh state, India*), and his death is known as the *Parinirvana*, the "going beyond nirvana". His body was cremated with great ceremony and the cremation relics were placed in an earthen jar. Soon thereafter the relics were divided into eight portions and these, along with the jar that held them and the embers of the cremation fire, were then distributed among the rulers of eight territories in which the Buddha had traveled and taught. The legends state that ten *Stupas* (Buddhist reliquary shrines) were constructed to house these sacred objects.

Prince *Siddhartha* was born as a human being with the inheritance of suffering common to human beings. He thought his own great exertion through his own dedication

developing his own innate activities such as faith, mindfulness, effort, concentrating power, insight etc; gradually, he rooted out single defilement and perfected himself.

The Teaching of Buddha *(Buddhavacana)*

During forty-five years Buddha·of wandering life after his enlightenment under the *Bodhi* tree, his teaching is acknowledge in the whole *Pāli* literature that has been fairly examined by various well-known scholars. The works of *Pāli* can be broadly divided into two classes: canonical and non-canonical.

The Canonical works are known as the *Tipiṭaka,* i.e. the three baskets: *Vinaya Piṭaka, Sutta Piṭaka,* and *Abhidhamma Piṭaka.*

• **The Basket of Discipline** (*Vinaya Piṭaka*) contains rules and regulations of Buddhist *Saṅgha* such as rules for reception in the order, for the periodical confession of sins, for activities of *Saṅgha.* It consists of the following texts: [31]

1. *Mahāvagga* 2. *Cullavagga*

3-4. *Sutta-Vibhaṅga*: *Pārājika* and *Pācittiya* 5. *Parivāra*

• **The Basket of Doctrine** (*Sutta Piṭaka*) consists of five collections called *pancanikāya*:

1. *Dīgha Nikāya* 2. *Majjhima Nikāya*

3. *Saṁyutta Nikāya* 4. *Aṅguttara Nikāya*

5. *Khuddaka Nikāya*

In the last division (*Khuddaka Nikāya*) composes of 15 works :

1. *Khuddakapāṭha* 2. *Dhammapada* 3. *Udāna*

4. *Itivuttaka* 5. *Sutta-nipāta* 6. *Vimānavatthu*

7. *Petavatthu* 8. *Theragāthā* 9. *Therigāthā*

10. *Jātaka* 11. *Niddesa* 12. *Paṭisambhidaamagga*

13. *Apadāna* 14. *Buddhavaṃsa* 15. *Cariyā-piṭaka.*

• **The Basket of Higher Doctrine** (*Abhidhamma Piṭaka*) is supplement to the *Sutta*. It consists of seven works as follows:

1. *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* 2. *Vibhaṅga* 3. *Dhātukathā*

4. *Puggalapaññatti* 5. *Kathāvatthu* 6. *Yamaka,* and 7. *Paṭṭhāna.*

And non-canonical

It is surveyed brief the establishment of *Nikāya* literature. *Nikāya* literature is constituted basis on the Basket of Doctrine (*Sutta-piṭaka*). It is a collection of all the discourses of the Buddha on various occasions, for various persons with different temperaments. These discourses deal with the practice of the pure life for the benefit of *Bhikkhus* and material, moral progress of the lay disciples. Buddhist scholars had general opinion that the whole of Buddha's ethics and philosophy lie in the *Nikāya* literature, which consists of the basket of doctrine.

Dīgha Nikāya

Dīgha Nikāya is the collection of long discourses of the Buddha. It consists of 34 suttas, which are divided into three divisions:

(a) *Sīlakkhandha Vagga* deals with 13 *Suttas,* Division Concerning Morality.

(b) *Mahā Vagga* deals with 10 suttas, the Large Division.

(c) *Pāthika Vagga,* 11 *Suttas,* the Division beginning with the discourse on *Pāthika,* the Naked Ascetic.

This collection is of importance for it contains some of the most valuable suttas such as *Brahmajāla Sutta, Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* etcIt discusses the wrong views then prevalent as well as Brahmin view of sacrifice and caste, and various religious practices such as extreme self-mortification.

There is one discourse, *Siṅgāla Sutta* addressed to a young *Brahmin* showing the duties to be performed by members of the human society Besides containing the ethical and philosophical teachings delivered by the Buddha himself, this *Sutta* is the earliest biography of Buddha's last stage of life. In addition, the prominent doctrines as the Four Noble Truths, the law of Causal Conditions the Four Foundations of Mindfulness, the Path to Freedom i.e. *Sīla* (discipline), *Samādhi* (concentration) and *Paññña* (*wisdom*), all are emphasized in this *Nikāyas*.

Majjhima Nikaya

Majjhima Nikāya is the collection of medium-length discourse .It consists of 152 *suttas*, which are divided into three books (*paṇṇāsa*):

(a) *Mūlapaṇṇāsa* deals with 50 *Suttas* in 5 *vaggas* (section or chapter).

(b) *Majjhimapaṇṇāsa* consists of 50 *Suttas* in 5 *vaggas*.

(c) *Upaṙipaṇṇāsa*, 52 *Suttas* in 5 *vaggas*.[32]

This *Nikāya* is extremely rich in its content. Each *Sutta* enveloped with deep meaning, which has attracted the preference of preachers.

Buddha taught the way to restrain the six sense vis-ë-vis six external objects, the ways to prevent all defilements of mind such as envy, ill-will, deceit, wrong views etcand harmfulness of desire. Also in this *Nikāya*, the complete principal doctrines are presented. There are some special suttas related to *Suñña* (emptiness) on which the theory of *Sunyatā* of the *Mādhyamika* School is based.

Some other well-known suttas as the *Alaggadupama Sutta*, in which the Buddha compared his teachings like a raft used to cross the ocean of births and deaths. The *Mahātaṇhāsaṅkhāya Sutta*, in which *Bhikkhu Sāti*, a

representative of ordinary human-beings, holds a wrong view that this *viññāṇa* (consciousness) has been wandering unchangeably from existences to existences in *Saṁsāra*. The Buddha insisted that the existence of consciousness is due to conditions; it is impossible to preserve it permanently.

Saṁyutta Nikaya

Saṁyutta Nikāya is the collection of the discourses arranged according to different subjects. The whole this collection has 56 *saṁyuttas* and 2576 *Suttas* of short is divided into five volumes.

(a)	*Sagātha Vagga* consists of	11 *saṁyuttas* (groups) with	276 *Suttas.*
(b)	*Nidāna Vagga*	10 *samy.*	284 *Suttas.*
(c)	*Khandha Vagga*	13 *samy.*	498 *Suttas.*
(d)	*Salāyatana Vagga*	10 *samy.*	376 *Suttas.*
(e)	*Mahā Vagga*	1142 *Suttas.*	12 *samy.*

About the content in *Sagāthā Vagga*, the *saṁyuttas* are arranged according to various subjects such as *Devatā (Devata-saṁyutta)*, *Devaputta-samy.*, *Māra-samy.*, *Bhikkhuṇī-samy.*, *Brahma-samy*, *Brāmaṇa-samy.*, and so on.

Nidana Vagga explained in the detailed formula, which is called '*Paṭiccasamuppāda*', Conditioned Genesis or Dependent Origination, consisting of twelve links of Causation.

Khandha Vagga is of the five *khandhas* (Aggregates) that constitute what is regarded as a being. Each of its components, namely, matter, sensation, perception, mental concomitants and consciousness is shown to be a bundle of *dukkha*, suffering.

Sayatana Vagga mentions of the six *āyatana* (sense organs or bases of contact named internal sense bases i.e. eye, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind), six corresponding sense

objects known as external sense bases (visible form, sound, odor, taste, tangible things and mind-objects), six *viññāṇa* (consciousness) that arises in relation to each pair of these internal and external sense based, six *phassa* (touch), six *vedanā* (feelings).

Mahā Vagga comprises of the whole basic teachings of the Lord covering both the theoretical and practical aspects. It arranged into different subjects, namely, the Eightfold Path, the Seven Limbs of Enlightenment, and the Foundations of Mindfulness. Generally, it consists of Thirty-seven Factors of Enlightenment. Besides, there also are the Four Limbs of Stream-winning and the Four Noble Truths. In the opening suttas, it is pointed out how friendship with the good and association with the virtuous is of immense help for the attainment of the Path and Perfection.

Aṅguttara Nikaya

Aṅguttara Nikāya is the collection of discourses numerical groupings and arranged serially in an ascending order. These short *suttas* are divided into five volumes, which comprise of eleven *Nipātyas* (parts).

(a) Volume I of three *Nipātas* (*Ekaka-nipāta, Duka-nipāta* and *Tika-nipata*) arranged in 54 *vaggas* (section or chapter) and consist of 960 Suttas.

(b) Volume II consists of the Book of the Fourth (*Catukka-nipāta*), 28 *vaggas* and 271 *Suttas*.

(c) Volume III consists of:

- The Book of the Fives (*Pañcaka-nipāta*, 26 *vaggas* and 1200 *Suttas*).
- The Book of the Sixes (*Chakka-nipāta*, 12 *vaggas*, 152 *Suttas*).

So the total number of this volume is 28 *vaggas* and 1352 *Suttas*.

(d) Volume IV consists of:

- The Book of the Sevens (*Sattaka-nipāta*, 8 *vaggas*, 80 *Suttas* and 1040 Suttas without numbering in the *Pāli* recension)
- The Book of the Eights (*Aṭṭhaka-nipāta*, 10 *vaggas*, 510 *Suttas*).
- The Book of the Nines (*Navaka-nipāta*, 10 *vaggas*, 432 *Suttas*)

So the total number of Vol. IV is 28 *vaggas* and 1022 *Suttas* and 1040 *Suttas* without number.

(e) Volume V consists of:

- The Book of the Tens (*Dasaka-nipāta*, 22 *vaggas*, 219 *Suttas*).
- The Book of the Elevens (*Ekadassaka-nipāta*, 3 *vaggas*, 25 *Suttas*).

So the total number of this volume is 25 *vaggas* and 244 *Suttas*.

Therefore, the five of volumes of *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* has 11 *nipātas*, 163 *vaggas*, 3849 *Suttas* and 1040 *Suttas* without number in volume IV, the Book of The Sevens.[33]

Aṅguttara Nikāya is very attractive and abundant in contains variety of subjects. It constitutes an important source book on Buddhist psychology and ethics.

Khuddaka Nikaya

Khuddaka Nikāya is a miscellaneous collection containing not only the discourse by the Buddha, but compilations of brief doctrinal notes mostly in verse, accounts of personal struggles and achievements by *theras* and *therī* also in verse, the birth stories, the history of the Buddha etc., may account for its title.

Khuddaka Nikāya[34] consists of 18 works as following :

Kuddakapāṭha

Kuddakapāṭha is a collection of small works only nine suttas. Most of which are also found in other parts of *Tipiṭaka*. It may be composed as a manual for a new novice under training, namely, (a) the three refuges (b) the ten Precepts (c) the thirty-two parts of the body (d) simple teaching for novices in the form of the body (e) *Maṅgala Sutta* (f) *Ratana Sutta* (g) *Tirokuṭṭa Sutta* (h) *Niṃhikaṇḍa Sutta* and (i) *Metta Sutta*.

Dhammapada

Dhammapada is a collection of basic and essential principles of the Buddha's teaching. It comprises of 423 verses grouped in 26 *vaggas* (chapter or sections). With deep meanings illustrated by the interesting stories, it has attracted people throughout the world not only for spiritual development but also for everyday living. . The *Dhammapada* describes the path of purity bringing to a happy life is impossible both now and thereafter, which Buddhist-people regard it, as bedside book should follow.

Udāna

Udāna is a collection inspired utterances of the Buddha in verses on unique occasions. Each *Udāna* in verse is accompanied by an annotation in prose of the circumstances that led to their being mentioned. It consists of 80 *Suttas* divided into 8 *vaggas*.

The content of *Udāna* deals with various subjects. For instance, the Buddha expressed his feeling the bliss of liberation in the first week after his enlightenment at the foot of the *Bodhi* tree; or he exclaimed for the ignorance of human-

beings who, because of the fondness for senses-pleasures, have done evil-deeds in relation to body, speech and mind to suffer bad *kamma* in the future; or he praised the monks who were diligent in practicing meditation; or the Buddha's explanation and praise of *Nibbāna*

Itivūttaka

This title means ' Thus was said (by the Buddha)'. *Itivūttaka* contains 112 suttas with verses and prose mixed. It is divided into four *Nipātas* (*Eka-, Duka-, Tika-, and Catukka nipāta*). The arranging in numerical groupings of *Itivūttaka* looks like that of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*. There is some doubt of the authority of *Catukka nipāta* when comparing the *Pāli* collection with the Chinese collection.[35]

The content of *Itivūttaka* comprises abundant various subjects. For example, the Buddha recommended in *Eka-nipāta "Bhikkhus,* abandon craving; I guarantee attainment to the stage of an *Anāgāmin* [36] (the fruition 3rd stage of liberation) if you abandon craving", or in *Duka-Nipāta* he exposed two forms of *Nibbāna dhātu,* manely, *Sa-upādisesa nibbāna dhātu* with the five *khandhas* still remaining, and *An-upādisesa nibbāna dhātu* without any *khandha* (the material body form) remaining.

Sutta-Nipāta

Sutta-Nipāta means 'the small collection of doctrinal lectures'. As well known as the *Dhammapada,* the *Sutta-Nipāta* consists of 1149 verses, which are further divided into five *vaggas* (chapter):

Volume I	- *Uraga-vaggga*	of	12 *Suttas*
Volume II	- *Cūla-vagga*	of	14 *Suttas*
Volume III	- *Mahā-vagga*	of	12 *Suttas*

Volume IV	- *Aṭṭhaka-vagga*	of	16 *Suttas*
Volume V	- *Pārāyana-vagga*	of	16 questions

The *Sutta-Nipāta* deals with various subjects in the important teachings of Buddha, which may be practiced in the course of one's meditation,[37] daily life,[38] such as 'True friends are rare to come by these days; a show of friendship very often hides some private ends. Man's mind is defiled by self-interest. So, becoming disillusioned, roam alone like a rhinoceros' [39]

It is related to caste,[40] and the welfare of human beings.[41] Some suttas are also related with the biography of the Buddha and the Buddha warning to human beings of the harm of *kamma* (sensual pleasures), of greed, of hatred, of existence.[42]

Vimānavatthu

Vimāna means 'mansion'. *Vimānavatthu* [43] is collection of stories of celestial beings that got divine mansion as result for their acts of merit in the former life.

The *Vimānavatthu* containing of 85 stories divided into *7 Vaggas* (chapters). The first four chapters are regarding celestial females with 50 stories and the remaining three consist of 35 stories of celestial males.

These stories concern those who have been reborn in *deva* realm by developed themselves to the stage of *Sotāpanna* (the fruition first stage of liberation); who have made obeisance to the Buddha with clasped hands; who had expressed words of jubilation at the ceremony of building a monastery for the *Saṅgha;* who observed the moral precepts; who had observed the precepts and given alms; who have been given alms (*dāna*) to Buddha and *Saṅgha;* who served in being a devoted wife [44] or in being a dutiful son to his parents[45]

Petavatthu

Petavatthu consists of 51 stories, which divided into 4 *vaggas* (chapters), describing the miserable states of beings that have been reborn in unhappy existences as consequence of their misdeeds in the previous life. These beings endured image of a spindle, hungry, naked, bad-smelled, foul and ugly because they're past life being that of either wicked women, stingy, unbelieving with a sharp tongue[46] or a rude behavior to a lone-Buddha.[47] Or they are irreligious people who had no faith and were possessed of the sin of avarice. Or they cheated people with either false measures or other tricks in their daily business.[48] There are also *Petas* who enjoy happiness as celestial-people (*devi*) on daytime, but have to suffer at nighttime.[49] Or they are with gold body but fouled-smell mouth.[50]

In other words, they have done bad *kamma* related to body, speech and mind through greed, hatred and delusion; so, due to the result of kamma-force, they have to suffer.

However, in the *Petavatthu*, the retribution of *kamma* of the miserable spirits is released dependent to the merit of their family. This event goes against the spirit of the Law of *kamma*-teaching of the Buddha. So, Thailand *Saṅgha, Theravāda* Buddhism does not regard *Petavatthu* as a canonical work. The *Petavatthu*, however, reflects one phase of Indic and Buddhist thought, even though it is on a lower level.

Theragatha-Therigatha

Theragātha and *Therigāthā* are collections of verses uttered by the elders and the lady elders of the *Saṅgha*. This collection consists of 1279 verses of 264 *Theras* and 522 verses of 73 *Theris* through pure jubilation and delight that arise their inspiration. These inspiring verses emanated from the hearts of *Bhikkhus* and *Bhikhunī* after their attainment of *Arahantship* as a message of their attainment and also as

statement of their effort, which has led to their ultimate enlightenment. These verses is also appeared when they attained freedom from the attachment of greed, hatred and ignorance; when they achieved victory in their meditation, in inner fight between the forces of good and evil; or they found bliss, peace and calm in their solitary life at glades and groves of forest

Jātaka

The stories *Jātaka* are the collection of the recounted by the Buddha about his previous existences before his enlightenment spent innumerous lives as a *Bodhisatta* for self-development by practicing pāramitās.

The *Jātaka* containing 547 stories [51] is divided into 22 *Nipātas* (or Books) according to the number of verses in each story. For instance, *Eka-nipāta* means group of stories containing only one verse, *Duka-nipāta*, that of two verses, till large number of verse etc.

Jātaka stories are well-established moral teaching as seen through the virtues of the Bodhisattva. It gives a vibrant depiction of the social life and customs of ancient India. There is irrefutable influence of *Jātaka* in Indian culture and arts, which still exist on the walls of *Bharhut*, on the sculptures of *Sānchi-stūpa*, and the caves of *Ajantā*.

Niddesa

Niddesa, which is ascribed to Ven. *Sāriputta*, literally means 'Explanation'. These exegetic works is regarded as earliest forms of commentary on some parts of *Suttanipāta*. It consists of two parts: *Mahāniddesa* and *Cullaniddesa*.

Mahā-Niddesa, the major exposition is elaborate elucidation of the *At.t.hakavagga* (the fourth *vagga*) and *Culla-Niddesa*, the minor exposition is annotation of the

Khaggavisāna sutta of the first *vagga* and the *Pārāyana-vagga* of the fifth of *Suttanipāta*.

Paisambhidamagga

This title means 'The Path of Analysis' which is attributed to Ven. *Sāriputta*. It comprised into three *vaggas* (division), namely, *Mahāvagga, Yuganaddhavagga* and *Paññāvagga*. Each *vagga* is divided into 10 *kathās* (sub-groups) namely, *Nāṇakathā* (treatise on knowledge), *Diṭṭhikathā* (treatise on views) Therefore the total work is of 30 *kathās* dealing with a detailed analysis reason of different subjects.

The way of writing in *Paṭisaṃbhidāmagga* is the same as that of *Abhidhamma*. But it is classified into *Sutta Piṭaka* is due to its begin with the phrase " *Evaṃ' me suttam' "* (Thus have I heard) as which are written in the form of *Sutta*.

Apadana

The word *Apadāna* means 'moral instruction'. It is a biographical work containing the life stories (past and present) of the Buddha and his *Arahant* disciple.

Apadāna entirely written in verse comprises of four parts, namely, *Buddhapadāna* (moral instruction of the Buddha), *Paccekabuddhapadāna* (moral instruction of the lone Buddhas), *Thera-apadāna* (moral instruction of the Elders), and *Theri-apadāna* (moral instruction of the Lady-Elders). These treatises are also classified into two groups, i.e. *Thera-apadānas* (compose of Buddhapadāna & Paccekabuddhapadāna) has 55 *vaggas* (sections), with 547 *apadānas* and *Theri-apadānas* consisting in 4 *vaggas*, with 10 *apadānas* each.

Buddhavaṃsa

Buddhavaṃsa means the history of the Buddhas. This work consists of 29 sections in verses, which related with

the chronicle of 24 Buddhas who are said to have preceded the Buddha *Gotama* (from *Dīpaṅkara*-Buddha to the Lord *Kassapa*). In chapter XXVII, there is the mention of the names of three Buddhas who lived before the *Dīpaṅkara* Buddha at different intervals of the same world cycle.

Cariya-piṭaka

The title *Cariya-piṭaka* means 'Basket of Conduct', which consists of thirty-five stories of Buddha's previous lives in 372 verses. The collection exposed the process cultivation fulfilled the *Dasa pāramitās* (or ten perfections) of a Bodhisattva throughout innumerable ages, in his long previous existences.

Cariya-piṭaka is arranged in three *vaggas* (or section), which illuminates seven [52] among ten *Pāramitās:*

Vagga I: *Dānapāramitā* (perfection of charity)
with 10 stories.

Vagga II: *Sīlapāramitā* (perfection of virtue)
10 stories.

Vagga III belongs to five *Pāramitās,* namely,

Nekkhamma-paaramitā (perfection of renunciation)
with 5 stories

Adhiṭṭhana-pāramitā (perfection of firm determination)
1 story

Sacca-pāramitā (perfection of truthfulness)
6 stories

Mettā-pāramitā (perfection of loving-kindness)
2 stories

Upekkhā-pāramitā (perfection of equanimity)
1 story.

Netti

Netti is short treatise, whic' composed of seven chapters. Its content is as the commentary of *Sutta.*

Peṭakopadesa

Peṭakopadesa is also short treaties, divided into eight chapters. It is different from the other books of the *Tipiṭaka* because they are exegetical and methodological in nature.

Milindapañha

Milindapañha is the last of the Books of *Khuddaka Nikāya.* It records the questions asked by King Milinda and the answers given by the Ven. Nāgasena (who attained *Arhantship*) about five hundred years after the *Parinibbāna* of the Buddha. King Milinda, who want to have some points on the *Dhamma* clarified, asked abstruse questions concerning the nature of man, his survival after death, and other doctrinal aspects of the *Dhamma*. Found on the teaching of the Buddha, the Ven. Nāgassena gave him satisfactory replies on each question asked.

Thus, the teachings of Buddha aim to open the door of true happiness, joyfulness. That is the path of the knowledge of life and the liberation from all ills. It applies and verified by self-realization. The practice of The Buddha's *dhamma* move man towards the perfect perception on impermanence (*anicca*) of all things, all mental activities; on No-Soul (*anattā*) of one's body and mental functions; on suffering (*dukkha*) contemplates the three kind of ill of body or mental pain on the state of Equanimity (*upekkhā*) as the balance of mind at the time of crisis and a moment of election from success and unexpected gain; on the mood of sympathetic joy (*muditā*) as antidote to the poison of envy and hatred ; on the practice of compassion (*karunā*), that is not only to mitigate the

suffering of others in his thought, but also in practical life ; on friendship (*maitrī*) as eagerly to help all and to be a protector of all beings ; on righteous-conduct (*sīla*) of man, aim at cleaning the body, on mind of its impurities.

All true *dhamma* want to infuse the structure of power with the canons of reason, equity and justice, which provide higher legitimacy to human being. Thus, to put it briefly, the Buddha's *dhamma* is really a human discovery. It motivates man to take the world a kingdom of enlightenment, without any help of Supernatural, God, and Brahma.

Source and date of the Nikāya

During Buddha's times, his disciple with deep affection and reverence heard his teaching. They learned it by heart, kept it in their minds and the senior monks handed it over to younger monks by that way i.e., orally.

According to *Cullavagga* three months[53] after the Buddha passed away,[54] Ven. Mahākāssapa proposed that a council be called to organize and agree upon the content of Buddha's teachings. **The First Council** was held at the *Sattaparni* cave near *Rājagaha* with the attendant of Five-hundred Arahant-monks in three months of the rainy season, under the presidency of Ven. Mahākāsapa and the patronage of king Ajātasattu of *Magadha*. In the form of question and answer, Ven. Upali recited about *Vinaya* and Ven. Ānanda about *Sutta* (*Nikāyas*). *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* was ignored at that time. In this way the teachings of Buddha were compiled for the first time.

After the *Mahāparinibbāna* (passing away) of Buddha 100 years, **the Second Council** was held at *Vaishali* to resolve the controversy the Ten Extravagances (*dasavathūni*) of the monk of *Vajji* country under patronage of king Kalāsoka for a period of eight months. Seven hundreds Arahant-monks

attended with the seat-regulator of Ven. Ajīta and Ven. Sabbakāmī as presidency, proclaimed the Ten Extravagance were unlawful. Then, the council preceded the recitation and consideration the *Vinaya* and *Sutta* (*Nikāyas*). The heretical *bhikkhus* left the *Saṅgha* and held another council for them called 'Great-Rehearsal' or *Mahāsaṅgīti*. It is the first schism of the *Saṅgha*, which it splited into two *Mahāsaṅghika* and *Sthavīravāda* (*or Theravāda* or *Vibhajjavāda*).[55]

The Third Council was held at the *Pātaliputra* (modern *Patna*) under support of great Buddhist King Asoka of *Magadha* about 308-247 BC.[56] It was a party meeting of the *Sthavīravāda* and not a general meeting. The target of this council is to purity the teachings because of the appearance of many different sects. One thousand *Bhikkhus* (monks) participated under the presidency of Ven. Moggaliputta Tissa refuted the difference heretical doctrines based on the principle of *Kathāvatthu-pakarna* during a period of nine months. By this time, orthodox doctrines the five *Nikāyas*, the *Vinaya* and the seven *Abhidhamma* were completed.[57]

One of the meaningful results of this council was the dispatch of missionaries to the different country of the world for the dissemination of the Buddha's teachings. Asoka's thirteen rock edicts confirm this information and the fact that the Great Emperor tried to spread the *dhamma* not only in his land or among the neighboring countries, but also in Kingdoms far off to the realms of the Kings of Syria, Egypt, Macedonia, Epirus (Greece), and Kyrene (North Africa).[58] Among of the delegations is that Ven. Mahinda (Asoka's son) who along with four *Arhant*-monks went to Ceylon (*Sri Lanka*) to propagate the Buddha's message in the island.[59]

The Fourth Council [60] was held in Ceylon in the six century after the *Mahāparinibbāna* (passing away) of Buddha under reign King *Vaṭṭagāmaṇi Abhaya* (29-17 BC).[61] In this council, the *Pāli* Canon along with its commentaries

(*Aṭṭhakathā*), which were formerly handed down orally from generations to generations were fixed in writing - (the *Tipiṭaka* in *Pāli* language & Singhalese script; the *Aṭṭhakathā* in Singhalese script).

The Fifth Council took place in *Mandalay* of Burma in 1871 AD under the support of King Mindon. It is of importance to know that the *Pāli* Canon fixed in this Council was engraved on 729 marble slabs place at foot of *Mandalay* Hill.

The Sixth Council was inaugurated in Rangoon of Burma, in the full- moon day of May, 1954 and ending on the twenty-five hundredth anniversary of Buddha's *parinibbāna* (passing away) in May, 1956 *Bhikkhus* from various Buddhist countries of *Theravāda* tradition in the world assembled together at the Council in which the *Pāli Tipiṭaka* was recited and steps were taken towards translating it into some modern language.

Thus the whole *Pāli-Nikāyas* established along with present form of *Pāli-Vinaya* and *Pāli-Abhidhamma* is the canon of the Early Buddhism (*Theravāda or Vibhajjavāda*), i.e., "The words of the Elders", the immediate disciples of the Buddha. However, some scholars, who did not believe that the collection of the teaching of the Buddha from the memory of various Buddhists peoples time to time is accurate. Such as R.O. Franke doubted and tried to prove that it is the work of a certain person. But all other scholars do not accept this opinion.[62]

In the *Tipiṭika*, besides a number of *Suttas* delivered by Buddha's disciples as Ven. Sāriputta, Mahā Moggallāna, Ānand, etc, the great part of suttas is speeches by Buddha himself. Since it was handed down orally over a period of five hundred years, the shortcomings, mistakes or additions are surely unavoidable. Therefore the right attitude of a Buddha's follower towards his teachings is note, examine

and analysis by wisdom. Only under the light of wisdom, we have objective and impartial attitude in the study the Buddha's words and this way one can get deep benefit.

References

1. V.P. Varma, '*Philosophical Humanism and Contemporary India*', Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (1979), p. 6. See Condorcet, '*Esquisse d'um Tableau Historique des Progress de l' Espirit Humain*' (1793). J.S. Mackenzie, '*Lectures on Humanism*', (London, 1907). F.C.S. Schiller, '*Humanism: Philosophical Essays*' and '*Studies in Humanism*' (London, 1912). Viscount Haldane, '*Philosophy of Humanism*' (London, 1922).
2. It could be traced to Greeks and Rommans in Athens of the 5th century B.C. Protagoras maintained, 'Man is the measure of all things.' Socrates in his study of man's nature also contributed to the humanist approach. The Romans too, continued the secular and rational approach to the study of human destiny and thereby were participants to the humanistic efforts.
3. Cf. Dhp. v. 129.
4. David Ehrenfeld, '*The Arrogance of Humanism*', pp. 3, 20.
5. See Marx, '*Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*', (1844), pp. 69-70, 95,97,102; George Novak, '*Humanism and Socialism*', pp. 20-21.
6. Petrosyan, '*Humanism*', p. 90.
7. Pragmatism is basically an epistemological or methodological position, which outlines the means of gauging the meaning and truth of a statement. See C.S. Peirce, '*Meaning of Truth*'.
8. E.O.R.E, ed. by Hastings, James, Vol. VI, pp. 830-831.
9. Jean Paul Satre, '*Existentialism and Humanism*', p. 56
10. Ibid, p. 54
11. Ibid, p. 55
12. Ibid, pp 55-56
13. Gabriel Marcel, '*Existentialism Background of Human Dignity*', pp. 147-148.
14. Corliss Lamont, '*The Philosophy of Humanism*', New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company (1965), p. 10.
15. S. Radhakrishnan, '*An Idealist View of Life*'. London: Geoege Allen and Union Ltd, (1984), p. 56.
16. Julian Huxley. (Ed.), '*Humanist Frame* (Introduction)', London: George Allen & Union Ltd. 1961.

17. Wazir Singh, *'Humanism of Guru Nanak: A Philosophical Inquiry'*. Delhi: ESS Publication (1977), p. 52.
18. Baker, E. *'Principles of Social and Political Theory'*, Oxford, 1962, p. 242.
19. D.O.P, ed. by D.D. Runes, New York, 1942, p. 132.
20. E.O.P, Vol. IV, ed. by P. Edwards, New York (1967), p. 69.
21. S.B. Indr., *'The Social Philosophy of Buddhism'*, Bangkok (1979), p. 44.
22. V.P. Verma, *'Philosophical Humanism and Contemporary India'*, Delhi-Motilal (1979), p. 7.
23. Jai Deep Singh, *'The Humanistic View of Man'*, New Delhi: Indraprastha (1979), pp. 7-8.
24. Dr. Jatava, *'The Humanism of Buddha'*, Jaipur (1998), p. 1.
25. N.V. Banerjee, *'Buddhismand Marxism: A Study in Humanism,'* Orient Longman (1978), p. 4.
26. Corliss Lamont, *'The Philosophy of Humanism'*, New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1965, p. 19
27. E.B, ed. by Philip W.G., Vol. VI, Chicago: 1768, Reprint 1990.
28. W.B.E., ed. by Scott Fetzer, Vol. IX, Chicago, 1992.
29. Frederick Edwords, *'What is Humanism?'* see http://www.access.jcn.com.
30. E.P.D, ed. A.P. Buddhadatta Mahā thera, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass publisher private limited, 1989.
31. According to the Pali Text Society, but Burmese tradition *Vinaya* texts is as follows: *Pārājika, Pācittiya, Mahāvagga, Cullavagga* and *Parivāra*. (U Ko Lay, *'Guide to Tipitaka'*, pp. 9-18.)
32. This division is of *Pāli* text Society, I.B. Horner's translation. Vol. I is composed of 76 *Suttas*, Vol. II, 30 (from *Sutta* 77-106) and Vol. III, 46 (from *Sutta* 107-152)
33. In *Khuddakapāṭha Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 12. Buddhaghosa says the total number of *Suttas* of *Saṁyutta Nikāya* is 7762 and of *Aṅguttara Nikāya* is 9557. In *'An Introduction to Pāli Literature'*, S.C. Banerji says *Saṁyutta Nikāya* composes of 56 *samyuttas* with 2889 *Suttas* and *Aṅguttara Nikāya* has eleven *Nipātas* with at least 2308 *Suttas*.
34. U Ko lay, *'Guide to Tipitaka'*, pp. 125-138. However, the most of Buddhist scholars agree to the first fifteen of *Khuddaka Nikāya*.
35. This Chinese collection is evidently translated from Sanskrit by Yuan-Chang in 650 A.D. The whole work consists of 65 *Suttas* and *Catukka-Nipāta* is absent from there.
36. See D. I. 156; D. II 92; D. III 107, or M. II. 146.

37. Sn. v. 5-7.
38. *Vagga* II, 6, 8-11 and 13-14; III, 12; IV 14 -16; in the last *Vagga*, the Buddha answered 16 questions of the disciples of *Brāhman Bāvarī*.
39. Vagga I, Khaggavisāna Sutta.
40. *Vagga* I. 7; M. 4 and 9.
41. *Vagga* I. 6, 8 and 10; II. 1, 4 and 8; III. 3, 5 and 8
42. *Vagga* I. 1, 3; IV. 1-2 and 7-13
43. It says that Ven. Moggallāna who with the intention to bring out to public the definite results of *kamma* to urge people diligently in practicing good deeds collected *Vimānavatthu* and *Petavatthu*. Having got permission from the Buddha, with his extraordinary magic powers, he went to heaven to question the past deeds of the happy gods and goddesses in heavens; and to the *Maya* world to question the miserable life of individual *petas* as well, and reported it to the Buddha who cited it as example in his preaching.
44. *Vimān*. i. 11-12; iii. 3-4.
45. Ibid. v. 2 and vii. 1-2 respectively.
46. Pv. 6 (41)
47. Pv. 7 (42), p. 240 tr.; 16 (51), p. 249 tr.
48. Pv. 14 (49), p. 247.
49. Pv. 10, p. 159; 11 (46), p.244; 12 (24), p.198
50. Pv. 2-3.
51. According to Burma tradition, *Jātaka* comprised 550 stories.
52. The concluding verses (verses 366-369, p. 36) showed that the complete ten *pāramitās* are illuminated in the work. Besides seven mentioned above, these three are missing: *paññā-pāramitā* (perfection of wisdom), *viriya-pāramitā* (perfection of energy) and *khanti-pāramitā* (perfection of patience).
53. Cull. XI; Dipav. I. 24 (p. 129 tr.) and V. 1-15 (p. 138-139 tr.); Mahvs. III. 1-42 (p. 14-18 tr.). Cull. Held that the function was performed within the rainy season i.e. in three months, while Dipav. and Mahav. mentioned seven months.
54. The date of Buddha's death is 543-544 BC or somewhere between 487- 477 BC. See,
    - A. Bareau, '*La date du Nirvāṇa*', JA (1953), pp. 27-62.
    - P.C Sengupta, 'Ancient Indian Chronology', Calcutta, 1947.
    - Etienne Lamotte, '*History of Indian Buddhism*', tr. Sara Webb-Boin (1988), p. 13.
55. Vin. Cull. XII; Dipav. V. 16-38; Mahvs. IV. 1-66. The historicity of the Second Great Council is generally accepted by scholars (except Ott Frank).

56. This date is still arguing by scholars.
57. Dipav. VII. 37-58; I. 25 and Mahvs. V. 1-282.
58. Rhys Davids, '*Buddhist India*', pp. 298-299.
59. Dipav. VIII. 1-13; Mahvs. XII. 1-55.
60. Some India scholars ('2500 Years of Buddhism', p. 42) mentioned the Fourth council was held under the reign of King Kanishsha in *Kashmir* (*Jalandhar*) about 100 AD. This council was predominated by *Sarvāstivāda bhikkhu*. That is why the *Theravāda Saṅgha* ignores it. The result of this council is: (1) To settle the dissensions in the *Saṅgha*. (2) Aversion of the *Dhamma* in Sanskrit was approved. (3) Commentaries on the *Tipitaka*, i.e., that of *Sutta Pitaka, Vinaya-Vibhāsa* and *Abhidhamma-Vibhāsa* were composed. The *Abhidhamma-Kośa* of *Vasubandhu* is based upon the last *Vibhāsa*. The council is important as it made Sanskrit the vehicle of *Mahāyāna* Buddhist scriptures and help Buddhism developed into China and Tibet.
61. D.P.P.N. II, p. 818; but Prof. Bapat in the '*2500 Years of Buddhism*', p. 44 mentioned 1o1-77 BC or some other sources believe the date of 88-46 .BC.
62. M. Winternitz, 'History of Indian Literature', p. 44.
63. Rhys Davids, '*Buddhist India*', pp. 298-299.
64. Dipav. VIII. 1-13; Mahvs. XII. 1-55.
65. [Some India scholars ('2500 Years of Buddhism', p. 42) mentioned the Fourth council was held under the reign of King Kanishsha in *Kashmir* (*Jalandhar*) about 100 AD. This council was predominated by *Sarvāstivāda bhikkhu*. That is why the *Theravāda Saṅgha* ignores it. The result of this council is: (1) To settle the dissensions in the *Saṅgha*. (2) Aversion of the *Dhamma* in Sanskrit was approved. (3) Commentaries on the *Tipitaka*, i.e., that of *Sutta Pitaka, Vinaya-Vibhāsa* and *Abhidhamma-Vibhāsa* were composed. The *Abhidhamma-Kośa* of *Vasubandhu* is based upon the last *Vibhāsa*. The council is important as it made Sanskrit the vehicle of *Mahāyāna* Buddhist scriptures and help Buddhism developed into China and Tibet.} see. 60
66 D.P.P.N. II, p. 818; but Prof. Bapat in the '*2500 Years of Buddhism*', p. 44 mentioned 1o1-77 BC or some other sources believe the date of 88-46 .BC.
67. M. Winternitz, 'History of Indian Literature', p. 44

2

Doctrine of Epistemology

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EPISTEMOLOGY

Doctrine of Epistemology (*prāmāṇyavāda*) or the doctrine of Knowledge is belonging to the category of philosophy. It attempts to analyze the concept of knowledge with a view to determining the criteria appropriate for making the distinction between valid and invalid claims to knowledge. It examines the means and sources of knowledge lays down the conditions under which claims to knowledge could be accepted to be dependable. Therefore, it may be said that the entire philosophical way of the Buddhist humanism depends logically on its epistemology as a way of life.

The way of life advocated in Buddhist humanism is based on its theory of reality, and its theory of reality has an epistemological foundation. Although the Buddha himself was not concerned with raising philosophical problems about the nature and scope of knowledge purely in the form a an academic pursuit and an exercise in logical analysis, to the extent that the way of life recommended in Buddhist humanism was claimed to depended on statements about the nature of man and the universe which were believed to be true, it became necessary to specify how the alleged truths a Buddhist humanism were to be known.

Epistemology attains its fullness power, as well enriches with whatever insights can be received from the purity of human mind. The primary concern of Buddhist humanism

was the attainment of emancipating knowledge. Through the concentration of thinking man is endowed with ability to cognize accurately phenomenal things of the operation in universe, as reality or truth. Man is emancipated from depending on the Creator, God These metaphysical problems are found the answer when one's mind opened the door of knowledge or epistemology.

There were sixty-two different religious and philosophical thoughts emerged in India as worldview theories about the nature of man and the universe at the time the Buddha. However, Buddhist humanism is to be outsider of these thoughts that leading to wrong or prejudice ideas. The epistemological foundations of the worldview of Buddhist humanism had already developed a considerably high level of critical and analytical inquiry of the intelligent truth seekers of that time.

The discussion of epistemological questions occurs in so far as it is related to the attainment of the ultimate goal of Buddhist humanism. The epistemological foundations on which these theories were claimed to be based Buddhist humanism also claimed that the teachings of the Buddha were meant for the intelligent or the wise and not for the stupid or the unwise. In other words, the knowledge of emancipation is the lever highest of wisdom (*paññā*) as the final stage in Buddhist humanism. To contrary ignorance (*avijjā*) is reason that cause the knowledge of emancipation cannot grow. It is identified into certain realities of life (*cakkhuṃ udapadi ñāṇam udapādi*) discoursed in the message of the Four Noble Truths.

According to Jayatilleke's opinion,[1] the three classes of epistemological ground accepted as particular way of knowing that it is popular in the pre-Buddhist background Indian thought. The first class of thinkers may be called the Traditionalists (*anussavikā*), who derived their knowledge

wholly from a scriptural tradition and interpretations based on it. The foremost in this class of thinkers were the Brahmins who believed in the sacred authority of the *Vedas*. To the second class belonged to thinkers may be called the Rationalists and Metaphysicians (*takkī-vīmaṃsī*), who derived their knowledge from reasoning and speculation without any claims to extrasensory perception. They can be identified with some of the metaphysicians of the early *Upanishadic* period and other independent thinkers who denied the reliability of the orthodox truth Vedic tradition such as the Materialists the Skeptics and most of the *Ājīvakas*. The third class of thinkers called the Experientialists, who depended on direct personal knowledge and experience, including extrasensory perception on the basis of which their theories were founded. Many of the thinkers of the Middle and Late *Upanishads*, some of the *Ājīvakas* and *Jain* were a belief in the super-cognitive powers of the meditative person (*yogi*).

These three classes of epistemological ground of the Pre-Buddhist background become the heading of discussion in the time of the Buddha. Regarding to the nature of the knowledge, *brahmin* Saṇgārava versed in the *Vedas*, which asks to the Buddha in the question: "There are some recluses and *brahmins* who profess the basis of a religion (*ādibrahma-cariyakaṃ*) after finding a final and ultimate insight (*diṭṭhadhammābhiññā-vosānapāramippattā*) in this life. Now where does the venerable Gotama stand among them?" The Buddha replies, "I say that there is a difference among those who profess the basis of a religion after finding a final and ultimate insight in this life. There are some recluses and *brahmins* who are Traditionalists (*anussavikā*), who profess the basis of a religion after finding a final and ultimate insight in this life on mere belief alone (*kevalam saddhāmattakena*) such as the Reasoners (*takkī*) and Metaphysicians (*vīmaṃsī*, lit. speculators). There are other recluses and Brahmins who profess the basis of a religion after finding a final and ultimate

insight in this life by gaining a higher knowledge personally (*sāmaṃ yeva*) of a doctrine not traditionally heard of before. Now I am one of those who profess the basis of a religion after finding a final and ultimate insight in this life by gaining a higher knowledge personally of a doctrine among doctrines not traditionally heard of before."[2]

The Buddha is identified among the class of teachers who base their teachings about the good life on what they have understood by some super-cognitive means without dependence on hearing from traditional sources (*pabbesu ananussutesu dhammesu sāmaṃ veva abhiññāya*). The Buddha has pertinent attitude adopting towards epistemological standpoint in respect and at the same time imparting way of knowledge in Buddhist humanism. However, the scholars and intellectuals who is incredulous that Buddhist knowledge describable as a kind of mystic intuition or not? Is Buddha the omniscient who spoken revelation or intellectual intuition as the means of discovering truth? Appropriate solution to these questions it is require a careful study of the Buddhist doctrines.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL ATTITUDE

Authority (*anussavikā*)

In the several passages through in the *Pāli Nikāyas* the Buddha mentioned his criticism to the authority (*anussavikā*). The Buddha insists on the importance of being guided, in a moral situation, cognitive ability acquired through one's own personal knowledge and understanding.

It finds many different types of knowledge from authority were accepted as valid by Indian thinkers. For example, the *Mimāmsā* School upheld the absolute authority of the *Vedas*. The *Nyaya* School treated the scriptural statements of the *Vedas* as a subclass of verbal testimony while the *Vaiśesika* School treated them as a subclass of

inferential propositions. According to the *Naiyāyikas* (*Vedas*) are reliable either because God (*iśrara*) who revealed it is trustworthy or because the seers who are its authors are trustworthy. The *Mimāmsakas* on the other hand denied any personal authorship to the *Vedas* and claimed that the *Vedas* are eternal. The importance a *Sabda* as means of knowledge in the post-Buddhist philosophical tradition shows that claims to knowledge on the basis of authority took many different forms.

The Buddha mentioned *anussavikā* (authority) in addressing the *Kālāmas*[3] and on another occasion in a discourse to *Bhaddiya Licchavi* [4] that six of the items have reference to knowledge, which is claimed on the basis of some sort of authority. It would therefore be better to consider the authoritative criterion of knowledge as a whole and inquire into the Buddhist attitude to it. There are six, which had reference to the acceptance of authority in the following order: (1) *anussavena*. (2) *parampārāya*. (3) *itikirāya*. (4) *piṭakasampadāya*. (5) *bhavyarūpatāya* and (6) *samaṇo no guru*.

The term *anussava* has identified in three possible senses. Firstly, it is used of the *Vedic* tradition as meaning 'divine revelation', systematically handed down. Secondly it could have meant 'authoritative tradition', the source of its authority being the Vedic or any other tradition. Thirdly it could have meant a report come from mouth to mouth.[5]

Anussara had come to mean the 'sacred *Vedic* tradition.' The *Vedas* were considered to have been handed down by an unbroken succession of teacher right down to historical times and this continuity of the tradition is tacitly assumed or in part asserted. According to the ancient Indian *Upanishads* it was often believed to have had a divine origin. The creation of the *Vedas* is attributed to an omniscient personal Being, *Prajāpati* or *Brahmā* who created origin of the world as well as human beings who is responsible for

everything, who will reward, who can forgive all human sins, and who is responsible for human lives after their death, who will send them to heaven or he will send them to hell. This supreme God could then be considered as the equivalent to the single God of the monotheistic religions, which emerged in the Middle East. The first of these was Judaism, which promoted one its Gods Yahweh about the 6th century BC. Next Christianity adopted the same God under the name of Jehovah who is represented as the 'Father' of Jesus. Finally Islam adopted the name of Allah for their only God. The *Brahma-Gāla Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* mentions to attribute of *Mahā Brahmā* following: " I am *Brahmā*, the Great *Brahmā*, the Supreme One, the Mighty (*abhibhū anabhibhūto*), the All-seeing (*aññadatthudaso*), the Ruler (*vasavatti*), the Lord (*issaro*) of all, the maker (*kattā*), the Creator (*nimmāta*), the Chief of all appointing to each his place, the Ancient of days, the Father (*pittā*) of all that are and are to be."[6]

The Buddha thinks no more of all these claims of *Mahā Brahmā*. He argues that *Mahā Brahmā* is seen simply a *Deva* (the term *Deva* literally means a shining or radiant being, and describes their physical appearance rather than their supernatural powers) unenlightened and subject to the process of existence (*samsric*) as determined by his *kamma*. Long-lived *Mahā Brahmā* will be eliminated in each cycle of inevitable world dissolution and re-evolution. The Buddha's view is that Gods may lead more comfortable lives and is addicted to all the sense pleasures, but in terms of wisdom might be inferior to humans. They are even represented as coming to receive instruction from monks and even lay persons. The *Caṅkī Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* refers to a discussion of the Buddha with a *brahmin* youth well versed in the *Vedic* scriptures (*tevijjake pāvacane kataṃ*). The *brahmin* youth wishes to know the Buddha's opinion on the attitude of the *brahmins* 'who came absolutely to the conclusion that only what is contained in the *Vedas* is true and everything

else is false' (*ekaṃsena niṭṭhaṃ gacchantiidaṃ eva saccaṃ mogham aññaṃ*) in respect of that which is a 'scriptural statement or hymn (*mantapadaṃ*) of the ancient *brahmins*. The Buddha criticized that the *brahmin* attitude amounts to one of blindly following a tradition (*andhaveṇi*) and the faith (*saddhā*) of the Brahmins in the categorical truth was 'baseless' (*amūlikā*). The *brahmin* youth replied that it is not merely on faith that the *Brahmins* claim the validity of the *Vedas* but also on the basis of *anussava* in Vedic scripture. This suggests that it had already become a sacred tradition, which was systematized, ceremonially chanted, and authoritatively handed down by a successive line of teachers (*gītaṃ pavuttaṃ samihitaṃ tad anugāyanti tad anubhāsanti bhāsitam anubhāsanti vācitam anuvācenti*).[7]

The Buddha's reasons reject *anussava* as a reliable means of knowledge. He always emphasis purity and impurity of one's mind depend on oneself. No God, Buddha or any human being can pollute or purify other one's mind as it is identified in several *Suttas* of the *Pāli* Canon. In the *Tevijja Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, the *Brahmin*'s claim about the divine origin of *Vedas* is criticized on the opinion that not even the original composers of the *Vedic* scriptures had direct personal knowledge of *Brahmā* by seeing *Brahmā* face to face.[8] The originators of the *Vedic* tradition themselves were not in a position to claim 'we know this, we see this' (*mayam etaṃ jānama mayam etaṃ passāma*) with regard to the existence of *Brahmā*. Here, the Buddha rejects absolute validity of *Vedic* scripture on the opinion that none of those who handed down the tradition could claim direct personal knowledge of its truth. Yet another criticism which the Buddha found to be commonly applicable to *anussava* (tradition) as well as four other grounds on which one may believe in the truth of a statement of faith (*saddhā*), personal like or inclination (*ruci*), superficial reflection (*ākāraparivittaka*) and approval of a theory upon speculative reflection or thinking

(*diṭṭhinijjhanakkhanti*) is that these grounds alone do not guarantee the truth of the relevant statements. The content of a revelation may be held in very high esteem for having been faithfully preserved, but Buddhist humanism argued that revelation is unsatisfactory because a statement may becomes not true, becomes not valid, and not enough criterion of truth. It may found to contain falsehoods and contradictions; meanwhile something else, which is not the content of such revelation, may be factual and true (*bhūtaṃ tacchaṃ anaññathā*). If one claims to have heard something from some source or to be firmly convinced of the truth of something, it does not logically follow that what he has heard or what he is firmly convinced of is true. On the other hand if one claims to know something and if he actually knows it, it must be true. Therefore, the Buddha pointed out that to be a true one, a statement has to be verifiable in the light of one's own experiences and experiences of other competent observers.

The Buddha did not reject the *Vedic* teaching out-right, but considered it to be put forward an unsatisfactory teaching for the noble life. Buddhists humanism were much more moderate in their criticism of the *Vedas.* It seemed to have recognized that the *Vedic* teaching contained factual and moral values and moral retribution, which among the beliefs formed part of the right philosophy of life.

The word *Parampará* may have stood for the unbroken succession of a teaching belonging to the *Vedic* tradition. The Buddha compares the generations of *Vedic* teachers to a string of blind men (*āndhaveṇuparampará*) cling to one behind the other in succession (*paramparāsattā*).[9] The term *Itikira* is the kind of knowledge based on authority, which has been translated as 'hearsay.'[10] The contrast is between the means of knowledge in the Buddhism and the means of knowledge in the *brahmins*. The Buddha's teaching is personally

verifiable in this life. The Buddha's *Dhamma* is not based on *itiha* (hearsay or tradition), but only *anitiha,* which meant that it was not based on hearsay or tradition.

Piṭakasampadā also may have stood for mean the acceptance 'on the authority of the *Vedas* scriptural texts' presumably on the principle that whatever propositions agree with these texts are true and whatever disagree are false. The other two forms of authority rejected are denoted by the terms *bhabbarūpatā* and *samano no garu.* According to the commentarial explanation of *bhabbarūpatā,* it stands for the acceptance of someone's words considering him to be a competent person (*uyaṃ bhikkhu bhabbarūpo, imassa kathaṃ gahetuṃ yuttaṃ,* i.e. this monk is a capable person; one ought to accept his statement).[11] The other ground of authoritative knowledge is *samāno no garu,* which may be translated as 'the respect to prestigious teacher'. It would have meant the acceptance of a statement on the prestige-value of the person uttering it. Both forms of authority can be considered under verbal testimony, which as a matter of fact came to be recognized as a means of knowledge in the late Indian philosophical tradition under *āptopadesu* or *āptavacana.* The criticism leveled against *anussava* (authority) applies to all other forms of authority as well although it is not explicitly stated with reference to them. Free inquiry is encouraged and advocated in Buddhist humanism as exemplified by the *Aṅguttara Nikāya,* where the Buddha says, "Do not accept a statement because it is reported, because it has come down as tradition, because it conforms to a scripture, because it seems to agree with logic, because it is nice to hear, or because the speaker responsible for its utterance has an attractive personality, or because the *sramaṇa*-teacher is worthy of our respect."[12] This is, in spirit, similar to the scientific temper of modern age, which has contributed to contemporary humanism.

Jayatilleke says that Buddhism is influenced of the orthodox teachings of the pre-Buddhist *Vedic* tradition in the formulation its own doctrines. It has often been suggested that the Buddha uncritically accepted some of the dogmas a Brahmanism.[13] However, an examination of the pre-Buddhist background shows that these doctrines were neither fully developed nor universally accepted at the time of the emergence of Buddhism. There is no evidence that the Buddha admitted them on the authority of the previous tradition.

Some scholars have argued that Buddhism as the religions of the revelation, faith and an authoritarian creed and the Buddha was an omniscient teacher to taken on the authority. Both Keith and Poussin agreed with viewpoint of Kern, who said that 'Buddhism is professedly no rationalistic system, it being a superhuman Law, founded upon the decrees of an omniscient and infallible Master.'[14] Keith goes on to say that 'he (i.e. the Buddha) is omniscient and he himself claims to be completely free from fault, one in whom no blemish can be found' (op. cit., p. 35). Poussin had expressed the views, addressing the third international congress of religions that 'it has been no happier in making out a comprehensive theory of the relations between faith, reason and intuition' (loc. cit.). He says that 'Buddhism was at the same time a faith in revealed truths and a philosophical institution' (op. cit., p. 33) and makes the following observations: 'documents and theories point to conflicting statements: the old Buddhism pretends and rightly to be a creed. But it admits the principle of 'libre examen'; still more it considers critical inquiry as the one key to the comprehension of truth ' (loc. cit) or 'Buddhism is a faith and a creed, a respectful and close adhesion to the word of the one Omniscient' (op. cit., p. 34). The Buddha not only denied that he was omniscient because he didn't create being and world as well as responsible about their fortune, but

also he denied person who can claim to be omniscient (*ye te evam āhaṃsu: samaṇo Gotamo evam āha: natthi so samaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā yo sabbaññū sabbadassāvī aparisesaṃ ñāṇadassānam paṭijānissati, n'etaṃ ṭhānan vijjatī ti na me te vuttavādino abbhācikkhanti ca pana maṃ te asatā abhūtenā ti,* i.e. those who say that the recluse Gotama denies that there can be a recluse or brahmin who would claim to be omniscient, all-seeing and having an infinite knowledge and vision, for such a thing is impossible, are not reporting me accurately and are accusing me of saying what is untrue and false).[15] In the *Khevadda Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya, Mahā Brahmā* is forced to admit to an inquiring monk that he is unable to answer a question that where do these four great elements cease to be?' (*kattaha nu kho bhante ime catāro mahābhūtā apari nirujjhanti*)[16] and advised the monk to consult the Buddha. The question is put forward that what is the realistic theory of the external world, viz. 'where does water, earth, fire and air not penetrate?' (*kattha āpo ca paṭhavī tejo vāyo na gādhati* loc. cit.) And the Buddha answers it. The fact that he answers it is not intended to demonstrate that the Buddha was omniscient but only that he is claimed the matters pertaining to the transcendent reality or *Nibbāna*.[17]

Disclaiming omniscience as the meaning of Creater, but Buddha claimed to have himself three kinds of knowledge (*ñāṇakathā*) belong to the way of discriminating knowledge (*paṭisambhidāmagga*),[18] viz. (1) knowledge of unlimited retrocognition, in 'knowing everything conditioned and unconditioned without remainder' (*sabbaṃ saṅkhataṃ anavasesaṃ jānātī*) [19] (2) knowledge of unlimited clairvoyance in 'knowing everything in the past, present and future' (*atītam anāgatam paccuppannaṃ sabbaṃ jānātī ti,* loc. cit.), and (3) the knowledge of the destruction of the inflowing impulses. It then goes on to claim that 'he knows everything that has been seen, heard, sensed, thought, attained, sought and searched by the minds of those who inhabit the entire world of gods and men.'[20]

Here, the Buddha gave redefinition of omniscience as follows: 'Herein a certain teacher claims infinite knowledge and vision as being omniscient and all-seeing (saying that) when he walks or stands still, when he is asleep or awake there is knowledge and vision present to him constantly and continually' (*Idha ekacco satthā sabbaññū sabbadassāvī aparisesaṃ ñāṇadassanaṃ paṭijānāti: carato ca me tiṭṭhato ca suttassa ca jāgarassa ca satataṃsamitaṃ ñāṇadaṣsanaṃ paccupaṭṭhitaṃ*).[21]

Therefore, one cannot hold that the Buddha claimed authority for his statements on the grounds that he was omniscient. Nor can one says that he received his knowledge from an omniscient divine source as seems to be implied in Poussin's statement that 'Buddhism was a faith in revealed truths.'[22]

Faith (*saddhā*)

It is said that preliminary stage in the spiritual progress of a faith is believed to play an important role. In the *Pāli* Canon the sense of trust, confidence or faith is contracted with knowledge (*ñāṇa*). Keith also has the similar view when says that faith in Buddhism is 'indispensable preliminary'[23] and it is the root of 'correct knowledge' (loc. cit.). The commentary to the *Puggalapaññatti* (descriptions of persons) defines these uses as follows: 'Faith is devotion in the sense of continuous adoration. Affection is classifiable as the affection of faith and filial affection. But appreciation and faith are identical' (*punappunaṃ bhajanavasena saddhā va bhattī. Pemaṃ saddhā-pemaṃ gehasitapemaṃ ti vattati. Pasādo saddhā pasādo vā*).[24] Sometimes *pasāda* (mental appreciation) is used as a synonym of *saddhā* (faith).[25] In *Dhammapada,* it is said the absence of *pasāda* (mental appreciation) is likewise correlated with absence of understanding, e.g. *saddhammaṃ avijānato pariplavapasādassa paññā na paripūrati,* i.e. the wisdom

of a person who does not increase).[26] Similarly, the *Vīmaṃsaka Suttas* of *Majjhima Nikāya* often use *ākāravatī saddhā* and *aveccappasāda* appear to be referring to similar stated of mind, which mean 'faith is called reasoned, based on understanding, on vision, strong' or 'rational faith' as opposed to a blind or baseless faith (*amūlikā saddhā*).[27]

The Buddha represented reason for rejecting both the traditional and fanatical belief. In the *Caṅkī Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* he critises the faith which *brahmins* have towards the *Vedas* and calls it *amūlikā saddhā* (groundless faith).[28] He compares the *brahmanis* tradition to a procession of blind men as none in the entire tradition can claim to have seen or known about the qualities of *brahman* with whom they aspire to attain companionship. The Buddha insisted that one must not accept even his own statements on the basis of faith alone but seems to demand that they be tested and accepted if they are found to be true and presumably rejected if they are found to be false. In *Aṅguttara Nikāya* he admonished that one may have unyielding faith in the truth of a statement but that statement may be false. "As the wise test gold by burning, cutting, and rubbing (on a piece of touchstone), so are you to accept my words after examining them and not out of regard for me."[29] The *Brahmāyu Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* records that the young man Uttara followed the Buddha for seven months investigating the Buddha's conduct to see whether the fame that has spread about him is justified or not.[30] Accoding to Buddhist humanism the value of faith (*saddhā*) has to analyze and examine carefully all any teachings, and then, in the end, man can decide whether to adopt them. If there is any wisdom, you can adopt it. If there is nothing, just leave it. Before one professes faith (*saddhā*) in a teacher one should examine the character traits of the teacher to see if he is a person who has a greedy, hateful or deluded psychological disposition or not. In the *Vīmaṃsaka Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha ask his disciples to

learning the range of another's mind, should make a study of the *Tathāgata* so as to distinguish whether he is a fully Self-awakened One or not (*vimaṃsakena bhikkhunā tathāgate samannesanā kātabbā sammāsam-buddho vā no vā iti viññāṇāya*).[31] The Buddha calls upon his disciples to do this inquiry on himself by observing the Buddha's behavior as stringently as possible to ensure that he is possessed of absolutely pure psychological dispositions. This *Sutta* suggests that even the Buddha's claim to full enlightenment is not an impenetrable mystery, but one that could be tested by an external observer. If the Buddha is enlightened, he will reach out of selfish motives (*lobhanīyehi dhammehi*), malicious motives (*dosanīyehi dhammehi*) or from delusive tendencies (*monahīyehi dhammehi*). If observation of the behavior of the Buddha shows that he is not free from those evil traits of mind, then the claim to be enlightened can also be judged to be false. After the process of preliminary examination it is said that one would feel that it was worth listening to his teachings (*evaṃvādiṃ satthāraṃ arahati sāvako upasaṅkamituṃ dhamma-savanāya*).[32] After that 'he realizes with his own higher knowledge some of those doctrines and concludes that (they are true) and then reposes faith in the teacher, believeing that the Exalted One was enlightened, his doctrine well-taught and the Order of good conduct' (*tasmiṃ dhamme abhiññāya idh'ekaccaṃ dhammaṃ dhammesu niṭṭhaṃ agamaṃ, satthari pasīdiṃ: sammāsambuddho bhagavā svākkhāto bhagavatā dhammo supaṭipanno saṅgho ti*).[33]

After examining and verifying, faith (*saddhā*) of Buddhist humanism is considered as a path leading to development of knowledge (*ñāṇa*) or wisdom (*paññā*) as it is mentioned in the *Caṅkī Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, "with faith born, he draws close; drawing close he sits down near by; sitting down near by he lends ear; lending ear he hears dhamma; having heard dhamma he remembers it; he tests the meaning of the things he remembers; while testing the

meaning the things are approved of; if there is approval of the things desire is born; with desire born he makes an effort; having made an effort he weighs it up; having weighed it up he strives; being self-resolute he realizes with his person the highest truth itself; and penetrating it by means of intuitive wisdom."[34]

It is also noteworthy that ultimately faith (*saddhā*) perhaps for simple reason that it merely initiates the path, but under the light of knowledge faith (*saddhā*) becoming wisdom (*paññā*). Such as in *Saṃyutta Nikāya* the valuation of knowledge over faith is found in the dialogue following:

- Niganṭha Nātaputta: Do you belief in (*saddahasi*) the statement of the recluse Gotama that there is a *jhānic* state (trance) in which there is no discursive or reflective thought and there is a cessation of discursive thought and reflection (*saddahasi tvaṃ samaṇassa Gotamassa atthi avitakko avicādhi atthi vitakkavicarāṇaṃ nirodho tiṃ*)
- Citta: I do not accept this as a belief (*saddhāya*) (*na khvāhaṃ saddhāya gacchāmi*).
- Niganṭha Nātaputta: See what an honest, straighforward and upright person the householder Citta is (*passantu yāva ujuko c'āyaṃ Citto gahapati yāva asaṭho amāyāvi*).
- Citta: What do you thinkṃ Which is better-knowledge or belief (*taṃ kiṃ maññasiṃ katamaṃ nu kho paṇītataraṃ ñāṇaṃ vā saddhāṃ*).
- Niganṭha Nātaputta: Surely, knowledge is better than belief (*saddhāya kho gahapati, ñāṇam eva paṇītataram*).
- Citta: (I can attain up to the fourth *jhāna*) Knowing and seeing thus, why should I accept this on the grounds of faith in any recluse or brahmin, that

there is a trance in which there is no discursive or reflective thought (*so khvāhaṃ evaṃ jānanto evam, passanto kassaññasa samaṇassa vā brāhmaṇassa vā saddhāya gamissāmi, atthi avitakko avicāro samādhi*).[35]

In *Aṅguttara Nikāya,* Piṅgiyānin answered to *brāhmans* what is reason that he has so great faith in the recluse Gotama as following:

> "Just as a man, well satisfied with some choice savor, longs not for other savors that are mean; even so whenever one hears his honor Gotama's *Dhamma,* whether in the sayings, the psalms, the catechisms or the marvels – none longs for the talks of others: the many-folk, recluses or *brāhmans*."
>
> "Just as a man, overcome by hunger and weakness, may come upon a honey cake and, whenever he taste, enjoy the sweet, delicious savor; even so, whenever one hears his honor Gotama's *Dhamma,* whether in the sayings, the psalms, the catechisms or the marvels – he wins elation, wins serenity of mind."
>
> "Just, as a man may come upon a stick of sandalwood, yellow or red, and, wherever he smell, at the root, in the middle, at the top – may come upon an exceeding fair, delicious smell; even so whenever one hears his honor Gotama's *Dhamma,* whether in the sayings, the psalms, the catechisms or the marvels – he finds joy, finds happiness."
>
> "Just as a clever physician might in a trice take away the sickness of one sick and ailing, grievously ill; even so whenever one hears his honor Gotama's *Dhamma,* whether in the sayings, the psalms, the catechisms or the marvels – grief, lamentation, suffering, sorrow and despair vanish away."
>
> "Just as a man, tortured by heat, by heat foe spent, wearied, craving and thirsty, might come to a pool

clear, sweet, cool, limpid, a lovely resting-place, and might plunge therein, bathe and drink, and allay all woe, fatigue and fret; even so whenever one hears his honor Gotama's *Dhamma*, whether in the sayings, the psalms, the catechisms or the marvels – all woe, fatigue and fret is wholly allayed."[36]

The Buddhist humanism did not promise rewards heavenly bliss or gaining enlightenment of *Nibbāna* to those who called themselves neither followers nor promise salvation to those who had faith, as well as did not threat to those who no had faith to follow. The Buddha did not merely suppose the belief in survival or moral responsibility but uses rational considerations as the way that lead to a belief as the first step of knowledge. The Buddha on the other hand never claimed anything like receiving knowledge from outside sources throughout his ministry he always asserted that his listeners were free to question him and challenge his teachings so that they could personally realize the truth. He said, "Come and see" (*ehipassiku*). He did not say, 'Come and believe.' Whenever he spoke anything, it was because he had personally tested the validity of the saying for himself as an ordinary human being. He claimed no divinity. He understood everything because he knew how he had to suffer during so many previous births for all the bad deeds he had committed through ignorance. He had learned the hard way. He advised his followers through his own experience. He had done tremendous service to mankind by practicing and observing the great perfection (*paramis*) over countless lifetimes and finally experienced the supreme bliss. He always maintained that he is just who showed the moon had to see the moon. He could make everyone see through the direction of his finger. In *Aṅguttara Nikāya* the question of who superior viz. *kāyasakkhi* (one who testified to the truth with body), *diṭṭhipatta* (one who has won view) and *saddhāvimutta* (one released by faith) is discussed. The

Buddha explained that it is no easy thing to decide off-hand about this matter as any one of these persons may be a once-returners (*sakadāgāmi*) or non-returners (*anāgāmi*) one on the path to *arahant*-ship (saint-ship).[37] The *Kitāgiri Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* clearly states the spiritual attainments of the freed through faith (*saddhāvimutta*) that one who has not physically experienced those non-material peaceful deliverances which transcend materiality, but with wisdom he has seen and destroyed some influxes. His faith is fix, deep rooted and established some more to accomplish through diligence.[38] In the *Alagaddūpama Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha too says that anyone who are led by the teaching (*dhamma*) and faith (*saddhā*) are heading towards enlightenment (*ye te bhikkhū dhammānusārino saddhānusārino sabbe te sambodhiparāyaṇā*).[39]

This Buddhist humanism attitude towards faith is expressed in the words of Ven. Nāgārjuna: "One associate with the teaching out of faith, but one knows as it really is through understanding: understanding *(prajñā)* is superior although faith precedes it."[40] The path to emancipation of Buddhist humanism did not ask man merely to believe. It was a way (path) where one was free to doubt. It offered a practical way of finding out the Truth through one's own experience rather than through accepting the teachings of other people. In other words, the faith of man refers to the scientific attitude that the teachings (*dhammas*) approach of studying, questioning, understanding, practicing. One should not accept anything without careful examination, study, questioning, testing and observation. This is in accordance with the cardinal principle of humanism: "All beliefs must be founded on reason and human experience. Where the progress of knowledge reveals that any belief is or becomes untenable it should be abandoned."[41]

Reason (*takka*)

It is said to have been in existence during the time of the Buddha, the various philosophical dogmas categorically stated to be based on reasoning and speculative reflection (*takkapariyāhatam vīmaṃsānucaritaṃ sayaṃpaṭibhāṇam*).[42] In the *Brahmajāla Suttas* of *Dīgha Nikāya* it speak of recluses and *brahmins* who had mastered the theories of others, wise and subtle hairsplitters, who went about shattering the theories of others with their intelligence (*panṃitā nipuṇā kataparappavādā vālasedhirūpā vobhindantā maññe paññāgatena diṭṭgatāni*).[43] They are said to have participated in public debates sometimes with the intention of proving their own theses or with the intention of rationally demolishing the theories of others. The Buddha does not belong to the class of teachers who are reasoners (*takkī*) and speculator (*vīmaṃsī*). He grounds that 'the reasoning may be valid or invalid' (*sutakkitampi hoti, dutakkitampi hoti*) and even if it is valid, the conclusions may be true or false of reality (*tathapi hoti annathapi hoti*).[44]

In the *Kālāma Sutta* of *Aṅguttara Nikāya* the four grounds of ten in all criticism as knowledge unsatisfactory from can be identified as involving some kind of reasoning or reflection as following: (1) *takka-hetu* (2) *naya-hetu* (3) *ākāra-parivitakkena* and (4) *diṭṭhi-nijjhānekkhantiyā*.

The term *takka-hetu* (doubt or reasoning) is employed in the context of the philosophical controversies and debates, where people come to judgments about the truth or falsity of speculative theories (*takkañca diṭṭhīsu pakappayitvaa sacca musā ti dvaya dhammam āhu*).[45] The Buddha did reject a whole the elements of reasoning as split hairs and quibble. He himself says that he agrees with them and disagrees with them as to some other points. They may or not may be good (*sādhu*) and bad (*na sādhu*).[46] The Buddha claims that reasoners 'learned men' (*paṇṃitā*) should not dialecticians

or casuists but were sharp critics, who made a rational consideration of the views they studied. For this opinion he has made many converts from among them, even without the requirement of answering their questions or engaging them in debate (*na pañhaṃ pucchanti kuto vādaṃ āropessanti, aññadatthu Bhagavato savākā sampajjanti*).[47] According to Buddhaghosa's commentary, there are four types of reasoners (*takkī*): (1) *unussutiko*, one who reasons on a premise based on tradition (or report), (2) *jātissaratakki*, one who reasons on a premise based on retro-cognition, (3) *lābhitakkiko*, one who reasons on a premise based on *jhānic* experience and (4) *Suddhatakkiko*, one who accepts theory on pure reasoning of the form if p is true, q is true or if p is true, q is not true.'[48]

The term *Naya-hetu* is said in the meaning of inference. According to *Jātaka*, it is used for 'right inference' (*nayaṃ nayati medhāvi*, i.e. the wise man draws a right inference) as opposed to 'wrong inference' (*anayaṃ nayati dummedho*, i.e. the fool draws a wrong inference).[49]

The term *ākāraparivitakka* is meaning of the study of conditions, careful consideration, and examination of reasons. The commentary of *Aṅguttara Nikāya* explains it as "accepting something thinking this is a good reason for accepting it" (*sundaram idaṃ kāraṇan ti evaṃ kāraṇa-parivitakkena*).[50] As instances in the *Vīmaṃsaka Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, it is said that if other were to question a monk as to "what were the reasons (*ākārā*) or the ground (anvayā) on which he says that 'the Exalted One is perfectly enlightened'" (*ke ākārā ke anvayā yen'āyasmā evam vadesi: sammāsambuddho Bhagavā*).[51] He should be in a position to reply that he has studied the *Dhamma* and "had come to realize by his own personal higher knowledge the truth of part of the *Dhamma* and has come to the conclusion (on this basis) that 'the Exalted One was perfectly enlightened"' (*tathā*

thatā 'haṃ tasmiṃ dhamme abhiññāya idh'ekaccaṃ dhammaṃ dhammesu niṭṭhaṃ agamaṃ sammāsambuddho Bhagavā, loc. cit.).[52] Therefore, it is said that 'one should not accept (anything as true) after reflecting on reason' what is meant is reflecting on reasons, not quite adequate for one to claim knowledge.

Another term is *diṭṭhi-nijjhāna-kkhanti* which gives meaning forbearance with wrong views. The commentary of *Aṅguttara Nikāya* explains as accepting something because it agrees with a view that one holds with conviction after reflecting on it *(amhākaṃ nijjhāyitvā khamitvā gahitadiṭṭhiyā saddhisṃ sameti*).[53]

The term *takka* (reason) may be construed, as a logical or epistemological criticism. Buddhist humanism appears to have criticized the attempt to construct metaphysical theories or the attempt to defend metaphysical dogmas already held by resorting to *takka* (reason). In the *Cūḷa-Māluṅkyā Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* it was said that the Exalted One have been set aside and rejected metaphysical theories which have not been explained (*yān'imāni diṭṭhigatāni Bhagavatā abyāakatāni ṭhapitāni paṭikkhittāni- sassato loko iti pi asassato lokoiti pi*).[54] For instance when the Buddha is asked the question, consciousness a persons soul or is consciousness one thing and the soul another (*saññā nukho purissa attā, udāhu aññā añño attā*)?[55] He replies with the question, i.e. what do take to be the soul? (*kiṃ pana tvaṃ attānam paccesi*, loc. cit.). These certain questions are to be set a side (*thapaniya*) as meaningless since they arise out of a misunderstanding of the nature of the concepts contained in them. This is implicit in the Buddha's refusal to answer categorically certain questions of a metaphysical or transcendental nature as the world is eternal, the world is not eternal, the world is finite, the world is infinite, the soul is identical with the body, the soul is different from the body,

the saint exists after death, the saint does not exists after death, the saint does and does not exist after death, the saint neither exists nor does not exist after death.[56] To deal with philosophical debates, the *Mahāviyūha Sutta* says, "What some call the highest *Dhamma*, that others again call wretched; which one of these, pray, is the true doctrine (*vāda*)? For all these assert themselves (to be only) experts."[57] The Buddha sees the spiritually mature person the real sage (*Muni*) as one who is no partisan in the disputes that have arise.[58] In the *Cūlaviyūha Sutta* it is said, "Abiding by their own views, some (people), having got into contest, assert themselves to be the (only) expert (saying), 'One who understands this he knows the *Dhamma;* he who reviles this, he is imperfect.'"[59] The his imperfection, according to the Buddha, is the results of attitude in making a person puffed up with pride when people are overwhelmed by the passion for their own views (*sandiṭṭhirāgena hi te bhirattā*) and this obsession with their own dogmas becomes a great source of dejection and despair.

Thus according to Buddhist humanism's opinion, *takka* (reason) is not merely an unreliable means of knowledge but also a much abused intellectual instrument of the spiritually immature person. The Buddha's criticism of *takka* (reason) applies mainly to those who attempt to construct metaphysical theories without any concern for experiential facts. The Noble Truths of Buddhism are distinguished from the metaphysical dogmas that are the products of speculative reason no experiential basis, and consequently are unverifiable.

Some scholars are approved that the Buddha has very often been called a rationalist.[60] But the reason for calling him a rationalist has differed from views. Such as Tatia and Bhattacharya say would not like to give anything as dogmatic truth, but always based his views on the strong ground of

reason (loc. cit). For Poussin, Buddhism was rationalist mainly because it was non-mystical; 'if we were asked to characterize in a word the old Buddhist (*Pāli Nikāyas*) discipline of salvation and the old Buddhism as a whole, we should say that it is a form of rationalism. Every idea and every practice made use of by Sākyamuni to build up his theory and his rule of religions life have been freed from any tinge of mysticism.'[61] Radhakrishnan too says of the Buddha that 'he is a rationalist since he wished to study reality or experience without any reference to supernatural revelation.'[62] Another reason why Buddhism is called a form of rationalism is that it is non-metaphysical. Adds, he too calls the Buddha a rationalist stresses his empiricism when he says that 'he relied on reason and experience.'[63] In the same breath, he also calls him a rationalist in the strictly philosophical sense (in which rationalism is opposed to empiricism) when he says that 'he wanted to establish a religion within the bounds of pure reason' (loc. cit.).

In trying to determine whether the Buddha was a rationalist, Descates, Spinoza and Leibniz are considered the typically rationalist philosophers, since they tried to evolve systems of deductive metaphysics on the basis of view premises, axioms and principles that they considered self-evident or true. The closest approximation to this kind of rational metaphysics in the time of the Buddha were the systems evolve out of *takka-*, which were described as being 'beaten out of logic, based on speculation and self-evident' (*takka-pariyāhataṃ vīmaṃsānucaritaṃ sayaṃpaṭibhānaṃ*).[64]

According to Premasiri, it does not seem to be any justification when has sometimes been called the Buddha as a rationalist. Because, the term 'rationalism' is used in the Western philosophical tradition to signify an epistemological doctrine, which is in direct opposition to the one described as empiricism. Rationalist philosophers in the West were those who constructed deductive systems of philosophy

based on self-evident first principles. According to rationalist epistemology human knowledge is a superstructure built on the foundations of the deliverances of reason. The basic propositions of rationalist systems are not statements of sense experiences, but of intellectual intuitions, which have the status of indubitable truths.[65] Evidently, it cannot find any such premises in the Buddha's teachings.

Buddha's doctrines were a product of pure reasoning and were not based on any extrasensory perception or extraordinary insight. Sunakkhatta, who left the order dissatisfied, observes that 'the recluse Gotama does not have a distinctive knowledge and vision more than that of (other) men; he preaches a doctrine, which is a product of reasoning and speculation and is self-evident' (*natthi samaṇassa Gotamassa uttariṃ manussadhammā alamariyañññadas-sanaviseso, takkapariyāhataṃ samaṇo Gotamo Dhammaṃ deseti vīmaṃsānucaritaṃ sayaṃpaṭibhānaṃ*).[66]

Referring to the views that contradicted his teaching, it is seen *Upāli Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha is arguing to lead his opponent by process of questionings to contradict his own assumption.[67] Although Buddhist humanism does not advocate reason as a sure way of reaching truth, the Buddhist teachings have often been established in such a way on a rational foundation. For instance, in the *Apaṇṇaka Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha advises one that was inclined to be skeptical about the doctrine of rebirth, to lead good life purely on rational considerations. If one lives a good life, others honor one for one's moral qualities in this life itself.[68]

Analysis (*vibhajana*)

In *Nikāyas* literature Buddhist humanism is not the establishment itself by dogmatic theory, but had to rely on rational arguments based on a critical viewpoint. The Buddha

himself claims to be 'an analyst and not (a dogmatist), who makes categorical assertions' (*vibhajjavādo ahaṃ nāhaṃ ekaṃsavādo*).[69] In the *Madhupiṇḍika Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, the Buddha is claimed as one who 'knows what should be known, sees what should be seen, having become vision and knowledge' (*jānaṃ jānāti passam passati cakkhubhūto ñāṇabhūto*).[70] Even those who practice his teachings that they might also know, see, attain, realize and comprehend what they have not so far known, seen, attained, realized or comprehended (*yam aññātaṃ adiṭṭhaṃ appattaṃ asacchikātaṃ anabhisametaṃ tassañāyāya dassañāya pattiyā sacchikiriyāya abhisamayāya bhagavati brahmacariyaṃ vussatiti*).[71] It is important to see a way to truth leading to liberation that the Buddha discovered. That way is described as noble truth (*ariyasaccāni*) or higher knowledge (*ariyañāṇa*).

Buddhist humanism refers to forms of knowledge that variety of cognitive terms, namely, *saññā* (perception), *viññāṇa* (consciousness), *abhiññā* (special knowledge), *pariññā* (intuitive knowledge) and *paññā* (the knowledge of spiritual perfection or wisdom). The *Pāli Nikāyas* give details *saññā* (perception) and *viññāṇa* (consciousness) as the form of cognition perception, which arises on the event of the gathering of a particular sense organ with the corresponding sense object. The process of cognition is described in Canon as follows: "Depending on the eye and material forms, there arises visual *viññāṇa*. By the coming together of these three, there arises sense impingement. Depending on sense impingement, there arises sensation. That which one senses one knows in *saññā* way" (*cakkhūca paṭcca rūpe ca uppajjati cakkhuviññānam Tiṇṇam saṅgati phasso. Phassāccayā vedanā. Yam vedeti taṃ sañjānāti*).[72]

The activity of *saññā* (perception) seems to depend on repeat perceptual experience as well as the mind's ability to formulate ideas and recognize the sensory environment in

terms of them. Perception (*saññā*) is believed to lead to bondage and suffering through the process of illusion, obsession, and hindrance to spiritual progress (*papañca*), which involves a proliferation of concepts in the mind, linked to the notion of self and associated with the unwholesome emotions of craving (*taṇhā*) conceit (*māna*) and dogmatic belief (*diṭṭhi*). The *Madhupiṇṃika Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* represents this psychological process as follows: "mental consciousness (*viññāṇa*) arises because of mind and mental objects. The meeting of the three is sensory impingement; feelings are because of sensory impingement; what one feels one perceives; what one perceives one reasons about; what one reasons about obsesses one; what obsessions one is the origin of the number of perceptions (*sañña*) and obsessions which assail a man in regard to mental objects cognizable by mind, past, future, present" (*Yam sañjānāti taṃ vitakketi, yaṃ vitakketi taṃ papañceti yaṃ papañceti tatonidānaṃpurisaṃ papañcasaññāsaṅkhā samudācaranti atītanāgarapaccuppannesu cakkhuviññeyyesu rūpesu*).[73]

It is recognized that *saññā* (perception) as the characteristic cognitive response, which not bring high knowledge for the enlightenment of individual as in the *Mūlapariyāya Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* mentioned, 'the *saññā* (perception) response to any category of experience inclusive of the four material elements to which the whole of material reality can be reduced, all the data of the sense (*diṭṭha, suta, muta*), meditative experience and even the highest spiritual category conceptualized as *Nibbāna* involves an unenlightened response and consequently leads to bondage and misery.'[74]

In the consideration of Buddhist humanism, *saññā* (perception) do not define indelible and constants forms, but they are variable depending on the way one trains oneself. The perceptual responses of *saññā* (perception) are a conditioned response. In the *Poṭṭhapāda Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*

it is said that by the training refers to the systematic meditative cultivation of the mind to experience reality, some types of *saññā* could emerge and other types could cease to be (*sikkhā ekā saññā uppajjanti, sikkhā ekā saññā nirujjhanti*).[75] It is possible for a person to transcend altogether the *saññā* (perception) experience of material form, put an end to the experience of the resistance of material objects, withdraw the mind's attention from the experience of a plurality of objects and enter into and abide in a state of mental rapture in which the *saññā* (perception) experience would be of infinite space (*sabbaso rūpasaññānam samatikkamma paṭighasaññānam atthagamā nānattasaññānaṃ amanasikārā ananto ākāso ti ākāsānañcāyatanam upasampajja viharati ... ākāsānañcāyatana sukhumasaccasaññātasmiṃ samaye hoti*: loc. cit.).

Viññāṇa (consciousness) is the knowledge of discrimination referred to the perceptual awareness of the respective senses prior to conceptualization (*vijjanatī ti tasmā viññaṇan ti vuccati*).[76] It is difficult to distinguish the states of *paññā* (wisdom) and *viññāṇa* (consciousness) that they are intermingled. However, a disparity between the two states is, *viññāṇa* (consciousness) considered in the *Suttas* as requiring no special effort for its cultivation, while the *paññā* (wisdom) is also said to be associated with the cognition of spiritual truths.

Buddhist humanism's way of life and the worldview is known as it is derived from a special knowledge or called *abhiññā*. The *Saṅgārava Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* says that one who by fully understanding Dhamma of themselves only, although these truths had not been heard before, claim that, in regard to the fundamentals of the Brahma-faring, they have attained here-now to excellence and to going beyond through super-knowledge (*abhiññā*).[77] According to *Pāli Nikāyas*,[78] it mentions to the six powers of *abhiññā*, which

has attained by the Buddha and his disciples is known as following: (1) *iddhividha*, (2) *dibbasota*, (3) *cetopariyañāṇa*, (4) *pubbenivāsānussati*, (5) *dibbacakkhu* and (6) *āsavakkāya*.

Iddhividhā is explained as psychic powers, an extraordinary ability to perform certain acts like from being one he becomes multiform, from being multiform he becomes one; he passes without hindrance to the further side of a wall or battlement or a mountain, as if through airwalking on water without dividing ittravels cross-legged through the sky, like the birds on wing, etc.[79] To avoid wrong understanding of mystic power as assimilation from heretical view, the Buddha is represented as saying: 'It is because I perceive danger in the practice of these mystic wonders that I loathe and abhor and am shamed thereof.'[80] The mystic wonder that he himself believed in respect of concentration on purpose, on will, on thoughts and on investigation.

Dibbasota (clairaudience) can be classed together in that they merely involve an extension of the sensory capacities of the auditory sense that is paranormal power of hearing and discerning sounds both human and divine, which are not audible to the auditory organ. Such as in the *Udumbarikā Sīhanāda Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* it is said the Buddha heard with his clairaudient sense of hearing, pure, and surpassing that of man.[81]

Cetopariyañāṇa (telepathic knowledge) enable a person to examine directly and comprehend by one's own mind the mental traits in the mind of another. By this means one could know whether another person's mind is lustful or free from lust, hateful or free from hatred and so on (*so parasattāna parapuggalāna cetasā ceto paricca pajānāti sarāgaṃ vā cittaṃ sarāgaṃ cittan ti pajānāti...*).[82]

Pubbenivāsānussatiñāṇa (retro-cognitive knowledge) is said to be knowledge of remembrance of one's former state of existence beyond one's present life experience. It does not

enable a person to have any direct access into a past occurrence, but only to recall one's own previous memory experiences, just as one would recall the past experiences of the present life.[83] This is what was referred to above as *satānusāri viññāṇam*. This type of super-cognitive ability was considered as one of the experiential bases for the theory of rebirth.

Dibbacakkhu (clairvoyance) is the ability to experience visually, which beyond the range of the physical eye. The passing away of other beings and their arising in accordance with their character traits is said to be seen by means of this super-cognitive ability. The experiential basis for the theory of *kamma* is believed to be transmigration (*cutūpapātañāṇa*), which is a special appliance of *dibbacakkhu* (clairvoyance).[84] It is said that the prince Vipassi[85] and the *arahant* Anuruddha[86] who were attained this paranormal power (*dibbacakkhu*).

What remains to be examined is *āsavakkhayañāṇa* (i.e. knowledge of the destruction of defilements) the highest and that which is claimed to be unique to Buddhism. The term itself contains the meaning that it is a kind of self-transforming knowledge. Where the *Pāli Nikāyas* refer to this knowledge it is invariably associated with the insight into the Four Noble Truths, the understanding of the three characteristics of being and the comprehension of the law of dependent co-origination (*paṭicca-samupāda*). *Āsavakkha-yañāṇa* (knowledge of the destruction of defilements) is the knowledge, which leads to the eradication of the cankers and the introspective knowledge of one's liberated condition have minded.

It is clear from the above account that the Buddhist humanism notion of *abhiññā* (special knowledge) leaves no room for any mysterious objects to be apprehended by an extraordinary intuition. These super-cognitive powers are

valued merely because they are believed to augment factual knowledge of the world, which is ordinarily restricted due to certain natural limitations in human sensory capacities. However, Buddhist humanism does not consider these cognitive powers as essentially competent of leading to infallible truths about the nature of existence. Some recluses and *brahmins* who possessed these powers are said to have reached erroneous conclusions about the nature of reality on the basis the data of such super- cognitive experience.

Buddhist humanism also emphasizes the intuitive knowledge (*pariññā*) having from the comprehensive understanding of the nature of things. The way of *pariññā* (intuitive knowledge) for the attainment as mentioned to the *Mūlpariyāya Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, is the eradication of cankers.[87] In *Aṅguttara Nikāya* it expounds, the understanding of body, feeling, perception, the actvities and consciousness, as well as the understanding the destruction of lust, of hatred, and of illusion and the destruction of suffering.[88] In the *Mahādukkhakkhandha Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the intuitive knowledge (*pariññā*) lays down the understanding of what is the satisfaction in pleasures of the senses, what the peril, what the escape from them.[89] It is different from *paññā* (wisdom) as the knowledge of spiritual perfection is said to be developed on the basis of *sīla* (good conduct) and *samādhi* (mental composure). Both, *pariññā* (intuitive knowledge) and *paññā* (the knowledge of spiritual perfection) way are leading to free from all *dukkha* (suffering). They are the emancipating knowledge, which is insightful and goal-directed, culminating in the destruction of the cankers.

Paññā (wisdom) does not involve any mysterious intuition, but merely a self-transforming understanding as a result of right mental concentration. It is natural and not a supernatural occurrence: 'it is in the nature of things (*Dhammatā*) that a person in the state of (meditative) concentration knows and sees what really is. A person who

knows and sees what really is, does not need to make an effort of will to feed disinterested and renounce. It is in the nature of things that a person who knows and sees as really is, feels disinterested and renounces. One who felt disinterested and has renounced does not need an effort of will to realize the knowledge and insight of emancipation (*vimutti-ñāṇadassanaṃ*). It is in the nature of thing that one who has felt disinterested and renounced, realizes the knowledge and insight of emancipation.' (*Dhammatā esā yaṃsamāhito yathābhūtaṃ jānāti passati. Yathābhūtaṃ jānato passato na cetanāya karaṇīyaṃ 'nibbindāmi virajjāmi' ti. Dhammatā esā yaṃyathābhūtaṃ jānaṃ passaṃ nibbindati virajjati. Nibbinnassa virattassa na cetanāya karaṇīyaṃ 'vimuttiñāṇa-dassanaṃ sacchikaromi ti. Dhammatā esā yaṃ nibbinno viratto vimuttiñāṇa-dassanaṃsacchikaroti*).[90]

It is said, "when one dwells with heart possessed and overwhelmed by sensual lust, and knows not, sees not in very truth any refuge from sensual lust that has arisen, - this prince, is the cause of not knowing, of not seeing (likewise) malevolence, sloth and torpor, excitement and flurry, doubt and wavering and knows not, sees not in very truth any refuge thereform are causes of one's not knowing, of not seeing" (*Yasmiṃ samaye kāmarāgapariyuṭṭhitena cetasāviharati kāmarāgaparetena uppannassa ca kāmarāgassa nissaraṇaṃ yathābhūtaṃ na jānāti na passati ayam pi hetu ayam paccayo aññāṇāya adassanāya byāpāda- thinamiddha- uddhaccakukkucca-vicikicchā-*).[91] These five factors are known in the *Pāli Nikāyas* as the five impediments (*pañcanīvaraṇa-*)[92] that are 'defilements of the mind and factors which weaken wisdom' (*cetoso upakkilese paññāya dubbalīkaraṇe*).[93] "When the mind is emancipated from these five defilements, it is supple, pliant, lustrous, firm and becomes rightly concentrated for the destruction of the defiling impulses' (*yato ca cittam imehi pañcahi upakkilesshi vimuttaṃ hoti, taṃ hoti cittaṃ mudu ca kammaniyañ ca pabhassārañ ca na ca pabhaṅgu sammā*

samādhiyati āsavānaṃ khayāya).[94] In this state it is said that 'he directs his mind to those things which have to be realized by one's higher knowledge in order to realize them by one's higher knowledge' (*abhiññā-sacchikiriyāya,* loc. cit.)

It is not a contradictory attitude when the statement is made clear that 'the Exalted One (Bhagavat) had declared that there is not by (any philosophical) opinion, not by tradition, not by knowledge not by virtue and (holy) works can any one say that purity exists; nor by absence of (philosophical) opinion, by absence of tradition, by absence of knowledge, by absence of virtue and (holy) works either; having abandoned these without adopting (anything else), let him, calm and independent, not desire existence (*na diṭṭhiyā na sutiyā na ñāṇena ti Bhagavā visuddhim āha, addiṭṭhiyā assutiyā aṇñāṇā no pi tena*).[95] Wisdom (*paññā*) is said in Buddhist humanism as the decisive principle for the knowledge of spiritual perfection. For instance, the Buddha admonished his disciple as follows: "Material form is impermanent. What is impermanent that is suffering. What is suffering that is without the self. What is without the self that is not mine, I am not that, not of me is is this self. Thus one should views it by perfect insight as it really is. For the one who thus sees it as it really is by perfect insight (*paññā*), his heart turns away, is release from it by not grasping Āsavas."[96]

The Buddha always emphasizes that man does not hear that in such and such a village or town there was girls or women, passing fair to look upon, lovely, with a wondrous lotus-like beautiful, but has himself seen her.[97] It is said that 'he has seen it by himself and that he is not saying so after having heard from another recluse or *brahmin*' (*diṭṭhiā mayā taṃ kho nāññāssa samaṇassa vā brāhmaṇassa sutvā vadāmi*).[98] Would it be proper', he says, 'for him to say so if he had not known, seen, experienced, realized and apprehended with his wisdom' (*mayā c'etaṃ aññātaṃ abhavissa adiṭṭhaṃ aviditaṃ*

asacchikatam. aphassitaṃ paññāya vadeyyaṃ, api nu me etaṃ patirūpaṃ abhavissā ti).[99] He preaches what he has himself verified to be true but he claims that he could instruct an honest and intelligent person to verify for himself what he had verified: 'Let there come an intelligent man, guileless, honest and straight, and who says: 'I instruct, I teach *Dhamma*. Faring along as instructed it will not be long before (some man) of himself will know, of himself will see.' (*etu viññū puriso asaṭho amāyāvi ujjujātiko: ahaṃ anusāsāmi, ahaṃ dhammaṃ desemi; yathānusiṭṭhaṃ tathāpaṭipajjamāno na cirass'eva samāñ ñeva ñassati sāmaṃ dakkhiti*).[100]

Logic and Truth (*ñāya-sacca*)

Buddhist humanism exhorts that man should accepts and believes in the way of logic to attain the goal of truth. A truth based on the foundation of examination and re-examination. Because, there is the statement is said to be incorrect when they conflicted with what empirically observed. The *Potthapāda Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* stresses that when a proposition is unverifiable it becomes meaningless (*appatihariyam*). So that a proposition should be capable of being verified by others and then only it would become meaningful (*sappatihariyam*).[101] The Buddha warned in the *Kālāma Sutta* of *Aṅguttara Nikāya* that "Do not accept my teachings because they are taught by a King, or a Prince. Do not accept them because someone called Buddha teaches them. However, accept them if they are logical, if they are reasonable, if there is wisdom in them, and if there is some benefit."[102]

In the *Sutta-Nipāta* the Buddha argued with various theorists and showed the mistake in their theories of contradicting themselves referring to the question is asked 'Claiming to be experts, why do (they) put forward diverse theories are truths many and various?' (*kasmā nu saccāni vadanti nānā kusalā vadānā: saccāni su tāni bahūni nānā*),[103]

because 'Truths, indeed, are not many and various' (*na h'eva saccāni bahūni nānā*)[104] 'Truth is one without a second' (*ekaṃ hi saccaṃ na dutīyam atthi*).[105] This is very strongly recommended by the parable of the blind men and the elephant.[106] The king who instructs assembles a number of men born blind that they be show to touch an elephant. They touch various parts of the elephant such as the forehead, ears, tusks, etc. They are then asked to describe the elephant and each report mistaking the part for the whole that the elephant was like that portion of the elephant, which was felt by him. There are ten conflicting accounts in all correcponding in description to the ten parts touched and these are compared to the ten theses of mistake (*avyākata-theses*) put forward by the various recluses and *brahmins*. They have an élement of truth but are deluded in ascribing to the whole of reality what is true only of the part. It is fact that in the *Brahmajāla Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* not merely the ten theses of mistake (*avyākata-theses*) but all the sixty-two philosophical theories 'result from impressions' (*phassapaccayā*).[107] These theories were presumably only partial accounts of reality.

In the *Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha says, "I have preached the Truth without making any distinction between exoteric (secret) and esoteric (privileged) doctrine; for in respect of the Truth the *Tathāgata* has no such thing as a closed fist of a teacher who keeps something back."[108] As in the parable of the raft is intended to indicate the utilitarian character of the teachings or the truth of Buddhist humanism. The truths are as for a raft help safely a person cross a river and get to the other bank but however useful the raft may have been, he would throw it aside and go his way without carrying it on his shoulders; so the truths useful for salvation but even they should not be clung to it. Those who realize the *Dhamma* to be like a raft should discard the *Dhamma* as well, not to speak of what is not *Dhamma* (*kullūpamaṃ vodhammaṃ desissāmi*

nittharaṇatthāya no gahaṇatthāya).[109] Thus, one who aims to realize the truth should maintain a critical attitude on philosophical matters, or in other words one must have a right view first. The way to truth in the Buddha's *Dhamma* makes clearly on based of Four Noble Truths. In the *Alagaddūpama Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, it consistent that with the practice of the virtuous life, the development of mindfulness and the elimination of five impediments, the mind is emancipated from the inflowing impulses of sensuous gratification, personal immortality and ignorance; along with this emancipation arises the knowledge that emancipation has been attained.'[110]

The teaching of the Buddha is with reference to the absolute and ultimate truth. In other words, the Buddha never claimed to have created the *Dhamma*, what he discovered was the universal truth of the real nature or existence. This absolute truth is identified with *Nibbāna* simply meant peace or extinction, no more craving, no more attachment and no more selfishness. *Nibbāna* is not the realm of heaven as some one take for. Man cannot experience *Nibbāna* because one has craving, attachment and selfishness. When getting rid of these defilements one can experiences bliss of *Nibbāna*. This is to be a finding based on experiences and experiments.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL EMPIRICISM

The Buddhist humanism has emphasized on direct personal knowledge as a form of empiricism. The Buddha preaches what he has himself verified to be true, he usually advises his disciple, "Monks, do you speak only of that which of yourselves you have known, seen and discerned?"[111] Actually, to say that "*Dhamma* is well taught by the Buddha, it is self-realized, it is timeless, it is a come and see thing, leading onwards, to be understood individually by the wise" (*dhammo sandiṭṭhiko akāliko ehipassiko opanayiko paccattaṃ veditabbo viññūhi*).[112]

Though *Pāli Nikāyas* do not clearly mention experience or inferences (*anumāna*) in that sense, Jayatilleke said that the term *anumāna* (inferences) has been used in the sense of inference based on a general premise established on the basis of observation. It is distinct into two types of knowledge called *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa* could be interpreted as knowledge of specific instances of a causal correlation and the knowledge of a general inductive law covering the past, present and the future.[113]

The empiricism (though in a sense broader than its contemporary Western form) and the human based 'relativism' in Buddhism which would subscribe to humanism is seen for example in *Samyutta Nikāya* where the Buddha answered the question "What is everything?" that "It is eye and objects, ear and sound, nose and scent, tongue and savor, body and things tangible, mind and mental state This is what is called everythingthere is no other everything."[114] The Buddha adds in this context that anyone who speaks of anything over and above these senses and their corresponding objects cannot make oneself intelligible.

Keith does not agree with the above position, also do not seem to accept to the higher knowledge claimed on the source of the *abhiññā* (special knowledge). He is concerned with the special insight of the Buddha as a mystical one not open to any inter-subjective empirical verification. According to Keith, the Buddha like the sage of the *Upanīad* sees things as they truly are (*yathābhūtaṃ*) by a mystic potency, which is quite other than reasoning of the discursive type. The truth of this insight is assured by it alone, for it is obviously incapable of verification in any empirical manner.[115]

It may be argued that one could use paranormal powers to observe certain phenomena that cannot be observed by the ordinary senses such as the sphere of rebirth and the other realms of existence that are not merely acknowledged

by some people do not experience them. According to Buddhist humanism the achievement of the paranormal powers is a natural causal consequence of the appropriate mental training. Anyone can also gain the experience of these faculties when accomplish the required training of mind. However, in the *Subba Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* a *brahmin* Pokkarasāti represents the opinion that the claim of some recluses and *brahmins* to possess paranormal powers is an inadmissible false claim. The Buddha's response to this was that those who deny the knowledge of people who possess paranormal powers are like blind men who deny the existence of visible forms, colors and objects merely because they could not experience them.[116]

Buddhist humanism opines that all things in the universe, including both passive material phenomena and subjective spiritual phenomena, are subject to the working of a principle:

"Imasmiṃ sati idaṃ hoti;
imass' uppādā idaṃ uppajjati;
imasmiṃ asati, idaṃ na hoti;
imassa nirodhā imaṃ nirujjhati."

(When this (cause) exists, that (effect) is;
When this (cause) does not exist, that (effect) is not.
With the rising of this (cause), that (effect) arises;
With the cessation of this (cause), that (cause) ceases).[117]

All realities are only the combination of changing condition. They are built on a set of interdependent relations, which will give rise to the arising, continuity, and cessation of existence. This phenomenal interdependence and relativity is known as The Law of Cause and Effect regarded as The Law of Dependent Origination (*paṭiccasamuppāda*).

It is contrary with a number of 'arguments' in the West have been adduced to prove or disprove the existence of God.

One of the most popular is the 'first cause' argument according to which everything must have a cause, and God is considered the first cause of the Universe, as theory of Strict Determinism held that everything happens due to what one did in the past, due to the creation of God. The theory of causation in Buddhist humanism says that every thing must have preconditions for its existence, which knows no beginning and no ending. This law must also extend to 'God' should such an entity exist. But while the 'first cause' claims that God creates everything, it exempts God from the ambit of this law. However if exemptions are made with respect to God such exemptions could be made with respect to other things also hereby contradicting the principle of the first cause.[118]

The following verses from the *Bhūridatta Jātaka* brings this out, "*sace hi so issaro sabbaloke Brahmā bahūbhūtapati pajānam kiṃ sabbaloke vidah alakkhiṃ kiṃ sabbalokaṃ na sukhiṃ asi. Sace hi so issaro sabbaloke Brahmā bahūbhūtapati pajānaṃ māyāmusāvajjamadena c'apilokaṃ adhammena kimatthakāsi. Sace hi so issaro sabbaloke Brahmā ahūbhūtapati pajānaṃ adhammiyo bhūtapat Ariṭṭha dhamme sat yo vidahi adhammaṃ.*"[119]

(If the creator of the world entire
They call God, of every being be the Lord
Why does he order such misfortune
And not create concord?

If the creator of the world entire
They call God, of every being be the Lord
Why prevail deceit, lies and ignorance
And he such inequity and injustice create?

If the creator of the world entire
They call God, of every being be the Lord
Then an evil master is he, (O Aritta)
Knowing what's right did let wrong prevail!)

(Translated by Dr. Victor A. Gunasekara)

Most religious systems decompose the individual into a body and a soul. Soul is eternal and absolute created by God. In the Buddhist humanism, the division would regard as the body and mind. It is identified in the five component aggregates (*pañcakkhandhā*). Where the metaphysical soul (*ātta*) is may be found in the combination of *rūpa* (material qualities), *vedanā* (feeling), *saññā* (perception), *sankhārā* (impression), and *viññāṇa* (consciousness). In these five components the first of which (*rūpa*) was physical and the last four (collectively called *nāma*) were components of mind. This is represented in the example 'the stalk of *muñja* grass is separate from the fibred, the stalk being the one thing and the fibred another, although the fibred is pulled out the stalk (*ayam muñjo ayaṃiśīkā, añño muñjo aññā isīkā, muñjamhā tveva isīkā pavālhā*)[120] or 'a sword is different from the scabbard, the sword being one and the scabbard another, although the sword is drawn from the scabbard' (*ayaṃ asi ayaṃ kosi, añño asi añño kosi, kosiyā tv'eva asi pavāṭho*, loc. cit.).

It is clearly Buddhist humanism strictly rejected the *Brahminical* theory of the transmigration of soul by his alternative theory of survival, which has been realized by through extra sensory perception. Thus by rejecting the theories of divine creationism (*issara-nimmanavada*), sacrificial craft transmigration of an eternal soul (*atmavada*) and division of human beings into four ranks (*varnavada*), the Buddha emphasized the concept of a homocentric realistic world order, peaceful and having a value oriented religion, with a scientific outlook on man and his nature and the equality of mankind as well. Except *issara-nivamanavada* (creationism) of Brahmanism there was some other deterministic theories in the *sramana* tradition, viz. *'sabbam pubbekata hetu'* (*kammic* determinism) of Jainists, *'sabbavada'* (materialistic determinism) were the leading among them. Nigantha-Natapatta, leader of the Jainists maintained that 'whatever sensation the person feels, whether pleasurable,

unpleasurable or neutral all of them comes into being due to past deed (*kamma*). Their theory expounds that man is subordinated to his past deeds. He has to obey without any objection to them exclusively. Mahavira sanctioned rigorous self-mortificational practices to his followers to eradicate those past deeds (*kammas*). Nevertheless this *kammic* determinism appears to be a theory, which implies the limitations of free will of man. He himself cannot change his fate. Pleasure and displeasure of life is not a problem of man himself because the cause is an external one.

The Buddha rejected to answer all questions of a metaphysical nature, which is beyond the limits of human experience, and not increase the knowledge of emancipation. It is explicable from his statement: 'these (questions) are not connected with the goal, with the teaching nor with the fundamentals of the religious life and do not conduce to disinterest, dispassion, cessation, tranquility, higher consciousness (especial knowledge), realization and *Nibbāna*' (*Na h'ete attha-saṃhitā, na dhamma-saṃhitā, na ādibrahmacaríyakā, na nibbidāya, na virāgāya, na nirodhāya, na upasamāya, na abhisaññāya (abhiññāya), na sambodhāya, na nibbānāya saṃvattanti*).[121] This is illustrated in the parable of the arrow,[122] it is that a man struck with a poisoned arrow should be connected with removing the arrow and getting well rather than be interested in purely theoretical questions (about the nature of the arrow, who shot it, etc, which have no practical utility. The goal is that man should only be interested in realities, which have a convenient bearing on his life. The Buddha's silence is unlike in the case of Sañjaya who is said 'due to his stupidity and ignorance' (*mandattā momūhattā*).[123]

The Buddha did not reveal all subjects that he knew. He preached only that which is beneficial to human beings. Once when the Buddha was staying at the *Simsapa* Grove in *Kosambi,* he collected a few leaves in his hand, and asked the

Bhikkhus to compare them with the leaves on the trees. They said, "The countless leaves on the trees are beyond comparison with the few leaves in your hand." the Buddha said, "Likewise, the subjects not revealed by me, are innumerable although I know them because they are not concerned with benefit to human beings, do not concern the holy life, do not conduce to dispassion and perfect peace."[124]

People have a desire to know about the beginning of human life; if there is anything after death; how the soul transfers to the next life, if there is rebirth; whether the same soul is reborn in every life or not, etc. In regard to this, there is a great deal of research work and statements, but people do not accept them uniformly because the statements, even on the beginning of human life, are vague. There are still abiding questions about this. It is human nature: a questioner is not satisfied, and derides the person who cannot give an acceptable answer to what he wants to know.

Some people felt resentment against him by that the Buddha did not give any solutions to some problems of metaphysical. Such as in the *Cūḷa-Māluṅkya Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, a *Bhikkhu* named Māluṅkyaputta, in meditating he thought, "I have not yet heard what the Buddha thinks about whether the world is eternal or not, whether life is dependent on the body or not, whether beings will be different after dying or not, etc. Why does the Buddha not give exact answers to these questions? I will put pressure on the Buddha to preach about them. I will continue to practice his teachings if he explains these matters to me; if not, I will disrobe and reject his teachings. Then he went to the Buddha in a dialogue, and he said, If you have no knowledge of these matters, you should he absolutely honest enough to say 'I do not know about them'; if you do know, bring these matters to light so that I can practice your teachings."[125]

The Buddha said to Māluṅkyaputta, "Well, did I ever

say to you: 'Come, Māluṅkyaputta practice my teachings; I will explain these matters to you'?" Māluṅkyaputta said, "No, you did not." The Buddha said again, "Did you ever say to me: 'I will practice your teachings, if you explain these matters to me'." "No, I did not", Māluṅkyaputta said. "Neither you nor I said that, so why do you come to me, and speak like that? If a person disavows my teachings until he knows these matters, he might pass away without practicing my beneficial teachings. I will never preach about these matters", the Buddha said. The Buddha gave an example to Māluṅkyaputta: "When a person is pierced by an arrow smeared with poison, his relatives send him to a physician. But the patient might say, 'I will not permit you to draw out this arrow until I know the archer; whether he is a hunter or worker or merchant, whether he is black or white, where he lives and what kind of bow and bow-string he used etc.' Before he receives all this information he may pass away. He cannot regain his health by these endless questions. In the same way, whether or not the world is eternal, and whether or not beings will be different after death, etc., is not connected with benefit, not fundamental to the practice of the truth, and it does not lead to dispassion, calmness, wisdom and insight knowledge. Whether a man knows these matters or not, he will not be free from aging, death, sorrow, suffering, lamentation and despair. Therefore, I do not reveal these matters." And then the Buddha said, "Māluṅkyaputta, if you like my teaching you should accept what I have explained; if not, you can choose your own way."[126]

A householder came and said to the Buddha, in the *Kevaddha Sutta*: "Lord, this *Nalanda* is rich, prosperous, and full of people who have faith in the Lord. It would be good if the Lord were to cause some *bhikkhus* to perform superhuman feats and miracles. In this way *Nalanda* would come to have even more faith in the Lord." The Buddha replied, "Kevaddha, this is not the way I teach *Dhamma* to the

bhikkhus, by saying, 'Go, *bhikkhus*, and perform superhuman feats and miracles for the laypeople!'"[127] And what is more, Buddhist humanism is not dogmatic. The Buddha always encouraged people to submit every teaching, including his, to the test of one's own experience, which would pass the final judgment. Therefore, if a person finds that the teachings of the Buddha give no good results for him he may turn his back upon them. And there is no need to obtain permission from any official to practice the teachings of the Buddha if a person likes them.

There are some the explanations of ground that why the Buddha set aside these questions, as Jayatilleke brought forward three solution following: (i) that some questions were set aside for from reasons and others for other reasons, (ii) that on some interpretations the questions were answerable and on others not, (iii) that the Pragmatic solution need not necessarily imply that the Buddha knew the answers. While Keith is thought that 'He (the Buddha) is silent, not merely because knowledge of these matters does not tend to *Nibbāna*, but because men hold various opinions regarding them'. Nevertheless, there are very strong reasons in favor of concluding that the Buddha's teaching contained certain positivistic and empiricist feature. It is meaningless to ask whether one exists in, goes not exist in, is born in, is not born in *Nibbāna* still speaks of such a transcendent state as realizable. The Buddha was asked the question in a verse in the *Sutta-Nipāta* that the person who has attained the goal (the knowledge of emancipation)- does he not exist or does he exist eternally without defect; explain this to me well, O lord, as you understand it? (*Atthaṃgato souda vā so natthi, udāhu ve sassatiyā arogo, taṃ me munī sādhu viyākarohi, tathā hite vidito esa dhammo*).[128] The Buddha explains that the person who has attained the goal is without measure; he does not have that with which one can speak of him (*Atthaṃgatassa na pamāṇam atthi, yena naṃ vajju taṃ tassa natthi*).[129] 'The

Tathāgata (Enlightened One) freed from denotation by material shape, sensation, ideas, dispositions, and consciousness is said to be 'deep, immeasurable and unfathomable, like the great ocean' (*gambhīro appameyyo duppariyogāho seyyathā pi mahāsamuddo*).[130]

It is alleged that there are the differences between Buddhist humanism philosophy and Western philosophical tradition in an attempt to identify its epistemological position with what came to be regarded as logical positivism and empiricism. Premasiri said that philosophers in the Western philosophical tradition have for a long time been engaged in the research for the indubitable foundation of all knowledge combined with the pursuit of a single paradigm to which all knowledge could conform. He adds that 'the rationalists adhered to the view that knowledge has the nature of a deductive system founded upon the indubitable and self-evident truths of reason, while the empiricists insisted on the view that the most certain and indubitable knowledge claims are those about our immediate sense data. The consequence of both points of view has been skepticism with respect or certain areas of human knowledge. The admission of the mind as a sixth sense enables Buddhism to consider reason as a function of the mind. This appears to dissolve the absolute distinction between sense and reason on which the rationalist-empiricist distinction rests.'[131]

Buddhist humanism disagrees with the empiricist insistence on the significant role of the senses in human knowledge. It is said that inductive inference are considered the means of knowledge in *Pāli Nikāya* emphasis that 'knowing' (*jānam*) must be based on 'seeing' (*passam*) or direct perceptive experience, make Buddhism a form of Empiricism. However, the knowledge is not only derived from sense-experience but from extrasensory experience. As man is limited by the capabilities of his sense organs man tends to perceive his limited experiences as absolute.

Therefore with confidence man look into an empty room and say that there is nothing in the room though in fact the room is teeming with life forms that are so small that they cannot be seen by the naked eye. Similarly there are many sounds that man cannot hear. The universe as experienced by the wise is much larger, as they can, with their developed mind, tap into other sources of energy. Truth is absolute. However, what one perceives as Truth differs as it is limited by the capacity of his senses. The Buddha showed a path to develop one's sense organs so as to experience absolute Truth.

Buddhism does not maintain that the indubitable objects of knowledge are the deliverance of the senses, for it does not get involved in the pursuit of knowledge in the absolutist sense. Buddha's enlightenment is a mysterious single act of intuition but the discovery by means of the developed natural faculties of the mind of the cause and cessation of suffering.[132] Knowledge is had only as the phase of a gradual process of the salvation of discipline and concentration. It is not in a sudden act of intuition: 'I do not say that one can win the final knowledge at the very beginning; it is had from a gradual discipline, a gradual mode of action and conduct' (*nāhaṃ ādikeṙeva aññārādhanaṃ vadāmi api ca anupubbasikkhā anupubbakiriyā anupubbapaṭipadā aññārādhanā hoti*).[133]

Adhering to theory of knowledge Buddhist humanism pointed out the groundlessness of the creation myth. It is regarded not as structure of metaphysics but combines a pragmatic approach with a sense of realism in admitting the role of the senses, as well as the intellect in the various forms of human cognition discovered by the Buddha in the experience with different ways of life. It is acceptably when Dr. Warder remarks that 'the Buddha legend synthesizes the quest of the truth on scientific principles regardless of past traditions: observation of life, experiments in asceticism (under various teachers and independently), final deduction

of the ways to the end suffering.'[134]

In brief, the theory of epistemology in *Pāli Nikāya* prefers to the eight kinds of knowledge essential for attaining the goal of emancipation. It consists of six kinds of special knowledge (*abhiññā*), namely, psychic powers (*iddhividha*), clairaudience (*dibbasota*), telepathic knowledge (*cetopari-yañāṇa*), retro-cognitive knowledge (*pubbenivāsānussati*), clairvoyance (*dibbacakkhu*) and knowledge of the destruction of defilements (*āsavakkāya*); one of intuitive knowledge (*pariññā*) and one of the knowledge of spiritual perfection or wisdom (*paññā*).

Buddhist humanism insisted that what is essential for attaining such a goal is of higher knowledge that it not takes any interest in the argumentative discussion of general epistemological issues but was concerned with them only to the extent that such discussion was found to be relevant to its immediate goal. The two sources of perception (*paccakkha*) and inference (*anumāna*) are accepted in Buddhist humanism as based on the attaining of highest knowledge.[135] The conception of perception, however, is not only sensory perception but also including of extra sensory.

References

1. K.N. Jayatilleke, '*Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge*', London: Allen and Unwin (1963), Chapters 1-3.
2. M. II, p. 211.
3. A. I, p. 189.
4. A. II, pp. 191-193.
5. K.N. Jayatilleke, '*Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge*', London: Allen and Unwin (1963), p. 182.
6. D. I, p. 18. See M.I, pp. 326-331; S. I, pp. 142-144.
7. D. I, p. 241; M. II, p. 169.
8. D. I, p. 238.
9. D. I, p. 239; M. II, p. 170.
10. P.E.D., Ed. by T.W. Rhys Davids &.William Stede, s.v. *Itikira*.

11. AA. II, p. 305.
12. A. I. 188 ff.
13. K.N. Jayatilleke, '*Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge*', London: Allen and Unwin (1963), p. 369 f.
14. C.A.F Rhys Davids, '*Manual of Buddhism for advanced Students*', p. 50; quoted Poussin, '*Bouddhisme*', Third Edition, (1925), p. 132, fn. 3; also Keith, '*Buddhist Philosophy*', p. 33.
15. M. II, p. 127.
16. D. I, p. 223.
17. Cp. *avijjāgato Brahmā*, M. I, p. 326.
18. M. I, p. 482
19. M. I, p. 386
20. *Yāvatā sadevakassa lokassa diṭṭhaṃ sutaṃ mutaṃ viññātaṃ pattaṃ pariyesitam anu vicaritam manasā sabbaṃ jānātī*, loc. cit.
21. M. I, p. 519; cp. A. IV, p. 428.
22. K.N. Jayatilleke, '*Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge*', London: Allen and Unwin (1963), p. 381
23. Keith, '*Buddhist Philosophy*', p. 34.
24. 248
25. A. III, p. 326; M. I, p. 142.
26. Dhp. v. 38.
27. M. I, p. 320.
28. M. II, p. 179.
29. A. I. p. 253.
30. M. II, p. 135.
31. M. I. p. 317.
32. M. I, p. 319.
33. M. I, p. 320.
34. *Saddhājāto upasaṅkamanto payirupāsati, payirupāsanto sotam odahati, ohitasoto dhammam suṇāti, sutvā dhammam dhāreti, dhāritānam dhammānam attham upaparikkhati, attham upaparikkhatodhammā nijjhānam khamanti, dhammanjjhānakkhantiyā sati chando jāyati, chandajāto ussahati, ussahitvā tuleti, tulayitvā padahati, pahitatto samāno kāyena c'eva paramasaccam sacchikaroti, paññāya ca tam ativijjha passati*, M. II, p. 173.
35. S. IV, p. 298.
36. A. III, pp. 237-238.
37. A. I, p. 118.
38. M. I, p. 478.
39. M. I, p. 142.

40. G. Tucci, J Ras, (ed.), *'The Ratnāvali of Nāgārjuna'*, April 1934, p. 309.
41. Damien V. Keown, Charles S. Prebish, Wayne R. Husted, (ed.), *'Buddhism and Human Rights'*, Curzon Press (1998), p. x.
42. See, D. I, p. 16.
43. D. I, p. 26; M. I, p. 176
44. M. I, pp. 514-524.
45. Sn. v. 886.
46. D. I, p. 162.
47. M. I, p. 176; M. II, p. 123.
48. *Tattha catubbidho takkī, anussutiko jātissaro lābhī suddhatakkiko ti. Tatha yo 'Vessantaro nāma rājā ahosī' ti ādīni sutvā, tena hi 'yadi Vessantaro' va bhagavā sassato attā ti takkayanto diṭṭhim gaṇhāti, ayamanussutiko nāma. Dve tisso jātiyo saritvā, 'aham eva pubbe asukasmim nāma ahosim, tasmā sassato atā' ti takkayanto jatissara-takkī nāma. Yo pana lābhitāya, 'yathā me idāni attā sukhito atīte evam āsi, anāgate pi evam bhavissatī' ti takkayitvā diṭṭhim gaṇhāti, ayam labhī takkiko nāma. 'Evam sati idam hoti, evam sati idam na hotī' ti takkamatteṅ eva pana gaṇhanto suddha-takkiko nāma*, DA. I, p. 106-107.
49. J. IV, p. 241
50. AA. II, p. 305.
51. M. I, p. 317.
52. M. I, p. 318..
53. AA. II, p. 305.
54. M. I, p. 426
55. D. I, p. 185.
56. D. I, p. 16.
57. Sn. v. 903.
58. Sn. v. 912.
59. Sn. v. 878.
60. Poussin, *'The way of Nirvana'*, pp. 30 ff.; Bhattacharya, *'The Basic Conception of Buddhism'*, pp. 9 ff.; Radhakrishnan, *'Indian Philosophy'*, Vol. I, p. 359; Keith, op. cit., p. 14; Tatia, *'Studies in Jaina Philosophy'*, p. 7.
61. Poussin, *'The way of Nirvana'*, pp. 30 ff.
62. Radhakrishnan, *'Indian Philosophy'*, Vol. I, p. 359.
63. Op. cit., p. 359.
64. D.O.P, ed. by Runes, D.D, s.v. *'Rationalism.'*
65. E.O.B, ed. by Malalasekera, G. P., Vol. V, Fascicle 1, s.v. *'Epistemology.'*

66. M. I, p. 68
67. M. I, p. 376-378.
68. M. I, pp. 402-403.
69. M. II, p. 197.
70. M. I, p. 111.
71. A. IV, p. 384.
72. M. I. p. 293.
73. M. I, p. 112.
74. M. I, p. 3.
75. D. I, p. 183.
76. M. I, p. 292.
77. M. II, p. 211.
78. M. I, p. 69; S. II, pp. 217, 222; D. III, p. 281.
79. D. I, pp. 78, 212.
80. D. I, pp. 213-214.
81. D. I, p. 79; III, p. 39; cf. M. I, p. 502.
82. D. I, p. 79; III, p.100.
83. D. I, p. 81.
84. D. I, p. 82.
85. D. II, p. 20.
86. A. I, p. 23.
87. M. I, p. 1 ff.
88. A. III, pp. 26, 191; M. I, p. 66.
89. M. I, p. 85.
90. A. V, p. 3, 313.
91. S. V, p. 127.
92. D. I, p. 73.
93. M. I, p. 181, 270, 276, 521; II, p. 28.
94. A. III, p. 16-17.
95. Sn. v. 839
96. S. III, p. 44.
97. See A. III, p. 89.
98. Iti. p 58.
99. M. I, p. 475.
100. M. II, p. 44.
101. D. I, p. 191.
102. A. I, p. 189.
103. Sn. v. 885.
104. Sn. v. 886.

105. Sn. v. 884.
106. Ud. p. 68.
107. D. I, pp. 42-43.
108. D. II, p. 100.
109. M. I, p. 134.
110. M. I, p. 141
111. M. I, p. 265
112. M. I, p. 37
113. K.N. Jayatilleke, *'Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge'*, London: Allen and Unwin (1963), p. 441 f.
114. S. IV, p. 15.
115. A. B. Keith, *'Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon'*, Oxford, (1923), p. 90.
116. M. II, p. 201.
117. M. II, p. 32; S. II, p.28.
118. Statement made to a Multi-religious Seminar by Dr V. A. Gunasekara, *'The Buddhist Attitude to God'*. First Published: February 1993, Second Edition: April 1997.
119. J. VI, p. 208
120. D. I, p. 77.
121. D. I, p. 191; M. I, p. 431; S. V, p. 437.
122. M. I, p. 429.
123. D. I, p. 27.
124. S. V, p. 437.
125. M. I, p.426.
126. M. I, p. 427.
127. D. I, p. 211.
128. Sn. v. 1075.
129. Sn. v. 1076.
130. M. I, p. 487.
131. E.O.B., Ed. by G.P Malalasekera, Vol. V, Fascicle 1, s.v. *Epistemology*.
132. Ud. pp.1-3.
133. M. I, pp. 479-480.
134. Empiricists usually mean by experience, sense-experience, v. Ewing, *'The Fundamental Question of Philosophy'*, p.39; Russell defines 'Empiricism' as 'the assertion, "all synthetic knowledge is based on experience"', *'Human Knowledge'*, p. 516.
135. D.R. Jatava, *'The Humanism of Buddha'*, New Delhi (1998), p.11.

3

The Perspective of Existence

THE WORLD OF FLUX

The Existential Nature of World

The nature of world according to the view of Buddhist humanism is camouflaged in formula of impermanence (*anicca*), unsatisfactoriness (*dukkha*) and egolessness (*anattā*). Collectively these are called in Buddhist literature 'Three Characteristics of Existence' (*ti-lakkhaṇa*) or the 'General Characteristics' (*sāmañña-lakkhaṇa*). The first characteristic of existence maintains that the mysterious world is in a state of continual flux (*santāna*) "all existents are momentary."[1] All conditioned things or phenomenal processes, mental as well as material, that go to make up *samsaric* plane of existence are transient or impermanent. "All becoming are impermanent, painful, of a nature to change."[2] The theory of *anicca* (impermanence) in Buddhist humanism expounded the changing of world.

What is the meaning of *anicca* (impermanent)? In the *Nikāya* Buddha says materiality (*rūpa*) is impermanent. And feeling (*vedanā*) and perception (*saññā*) and formations (*saṅkhāra*) and consciousness (*viññāṇa*) is impermanent.[3] Canonical commentary summarized that the five categories (*khandhas*) are impermanent. In what, sense impermanent? Sense impermanent in the sense of rise and fall (*udaya-vaya*).[4] Again, 'All is impermanent. And what is the all that is

impermanent? The eye is impermanent, visible objects (*rūpa*) eye-consciousness eye contact (*cakkhu-samphassa*) whatever is felt (*vedayita*) as pleasant or unpleasant or neither-unpleasant-nor-pleasant, born of eye contact is impermanent. Likewise with the ear, nose, tongue, body and mind;[5] or, quite succinctly, "All formations are impermanent"[6] and "Whatever is inseparable from the idea of origination (*samudaya*) is inseparable from the idea of cessation" (*niroha*).[7] The canonical commentary adds, 'Materiality (etc.) is impermanent in the sense of exhaustion' (*khaya*).[8]

It is distinguished between the impermanent and the characteristic of impermanence, in *Buddhaghosa*'s commentaries. "The impermanent is to rise and fall and change, and because, after having been, they are not. But the characteristic of impermanence is their state of rise and fall and alteration, or it is their mode-transformation (*ākāra-vikāra*) called non-being after having been,"[9] again "the eye (etc.) can be known as impermanent in the sense of its non-being after having been; and it is impermanent for four reasons as well: because it has rise and fall, because it changes, because it is temporary and because it denies permanence."[10]

The impermanence (*anicca*) is discernible empirically in the events of worldly phenomenon, which always is the notion of 'rise and fall' from time to time. Externally it is founding the inconsistency of 'things', which extends even to the periodical destruction of world system.[11] According to the Buddhist humanism, really, whether of external things or the psychophysical totally of human individual consists in succession and concatenation of microseconds. The world-systems are in the inconstancy, ever changing. It will be destroyed in experiencing a sequence of formation, existence, destruction and void.[12] There is no exception at the physical levels to mind and body. Our physical body will undergo metabolism, passing through the process of birth, aging,

illness and death.[13] Whereas impermanence of physical things is readily observable empirically, impermanence of consciousness is ready discerned, until it is pointed out the course our mind being existence, staying, changing, and extinction. Even more impermanence, however, in the Buddhist humanism's view, is cognizance, mind or consciousness, which arises and ceases from moment to moment, just as a monkey ranging through a forest seizes a branch, and letting that go seizes another.[14] The Buddha's word to the monks was also a reminder of the truth of impermanence: "Indeed, O monks, I declare to you, decay is inherent in all component things. Strive for perfection through heedfulness." [15]

Almost scholars distinguished in three aspects interlocking constituent of impermanence, namely, (1) change, (2) formation (as 'this, not that', without which no change could be perceived) and (3) a recognizable pattern in a changing process (also called specific conditionality' (*idappaccayalā*), which pattern is set out in the formula of dependent origination (*paṭicca-samuppāda*).

The aspect of change is regarded as existent character of the world. In the progress of observation the Buddha realizes that the world is called in the meaning of transitory and void. It is transitory by nature that one perceives the world (*loka-saññī*) and conceives concepts about the world (*loka-mānī*) are called 'the world in the *Ariyas* discipline. The eye is transitory by nature ear, nose, tongue, body and mind is transitory by nature, mind-states, mind-consciousness, mind-contact, whatsoever weal or woe or neutral experienced arises owing to mind-contact – That also is transitory by nature.[16] It is void of the self in the formation of the eye objects eye-consciousness and the rest.[17] The impermanence or change is not stipulations that the Buddha created. It was constant process in natural existence of phenomenal things. Through his penetration and realization

in the world (*loke* or *saṃkhāraloke*) a world-condition (*lokadhammo*) the Buddha declares, teaches and defines it, opens it and analyzes it. As the Buddha says, "I quarrel not with the world (the world in the sense of other people). It is the world quarrels with me. No preacher of the Norm (*dhamma*) quarrels with anyone in the world. That which is not upheld in the world of the sages, of that I declare, "It is not." What is upheld in the world of the sages, of that I declare, "It is so." .... That is not upheld in the world of the sages there is permanent, stable, eternal materiality, not subject to the idea of change of decay in body, that I declare, "It is not" (Likewise with feeling, perception, the activities and consciousness). That is upheld in the world of the sages there is impermanent, woeful and subject to the idea of change of decay, that I declare, "It is so."[18] Change is just a fact and verified by direct immediate observation. The Buddha uses a typically simple way – 'component things come and go, arise and perish' (*uppajjhitva nirujjhanti*) or term '*Dhamma*' to describe change in meaning of nature.

Visuddhimagga pointed out that 'Impermanence' is not always obvious except sought out. "The characteristic of impermanence does not become apparent because, when rise and fall are not given attention, it is concealed by continuity However, when continuity is disrupted by discerning rise and fall, the characteristic of impermanence becomes apparent in its true nature."[19] The continuity is disrupted means when continuity is exposed by observation of the perpetual alteration of *Dhammas* as they go on occurring in succession. For it is not through connectedness of *Dhammas* that the characteristic of impermanence becomes apparent to one who rightly observes 'rise and fall,' but rather the characteristic becomes properly evident through their disconnectedness, (regarded) as if they were iron darts.[20] "If the getting of a selfhood (*attabhāva*) so small as this were permanent, stable, eternal, individual, by nature unchanging,

then the living of the life of purity (*brahmacariva*) could not be described as for the best destruction of suffering would not be set forth."[21]

The second aspect of the formation mentioned to the process impermanent is to have a beginning and an end, to have 'risen and fall.' "There are three formed characteristics of the formed: arising is evident; fall is evident and the alteration of what is present (*ṭhitassa āññathattaṃ*) is evident."[22] And one who possesses the three factors of ardent energy or endeavor (*padhāniyaṅga*) has understanding, possesses understanding (*paññā*) extending to rise and disappearance.[23]

The process of change is expounded by Buddhaghosa who makes use of the empirically observation. It is said that *asoka* tree's shoot in the course of a few day's from pale to dark red and then through brown, to green leaves, which eventually turn yellow, wither and fall to the ground.[24] Or it is use of the illustration of a lighted lamp. "Where it goes to when its oil and wick are used up no one knows.... But that is crudely put; for the flame in each third portion of the wick as it gradually burns away ceases there without reaching the other parts. That is crudely put, too; for the flame in each inch, in each half-inch, in each thread, in each strand, will cease without reaching the other strands, but no flame can appear without a strand."[25] By regarding seeming stability in ever shorter periods and minute detail, a momentary view is arrives at. Anything whatever, first analyzed into a five-category situation, is then regarded as arising a new in each moment (*khaṇa*) and immediately dissolving, like *sesamum* seeds crackling when put into a hot pan.[26]

This is further developed in the commentary *Visuddhimagga*: formed (*sankhata*) *Dhammas* by means of cause and condition, they're coming to be after not being, their acquisition of individuality (*attabhāva*) is their rise. When it

arises, it does not come from any heap or store; and when it ceases, it does not go in any direction. There is nowhere any depository in the way of a heap or store, prior to its arising, of the sound that arises when a lute is played, nor does it come from any store when it arises, nor does it go in any direction when it has ceased,[27] but on the contrary, not having been, it is brought into being by depending on the lute, the lute's soundboard and a man's appropriate effort, and having been, it vanishes; so too, all material (*rūpa*) and immaterial (*arūpa*) *Dhammas* come to be (with the aid of specific conditions), and having been, they vanish.[28]

The transience and perpetual renewal of *Dhammas* is compared by the images as dew drops at sunrise, a bubble on water a line drawn on water,[29] a mustard seed on an awl's point and a lightning flash[30] and they are as coreless (*nissāra*) as a conjuring trick,[31] a mirage,[32] a dream,[33] a whirling firebrand's circle (*alāta-cakka*), a goblin city (*gandhabbha-nagara*), froth [34] a plantain trunk[35] and so on.

The question of the extent (*addhāna*) of the moment (*khaṇa*), as conceived in the commentaries, must be examined. In *Nikāya Sutta* cited above gave 'arising, fall and alteration of what is present' as three characteristics of anything formed. In the commentaries this is restated as 'rise, presence and dissolution' (*uppāda-ṭhiti-bhaṅga*),[36] which are each also called 'sub-moments' (*khaṇa*).

The third aspect of impermanence is the pattern or structure of specific conditionality, still remains. It is briefly stated, "this being, that becomes; from the arising of this, that arises; this not being, that becomes not; from the ceasing of this, that ceases."[37] Buddha has told cause of *Dhammas* that come into being due to a cause that which brings their cessation too. In more detail it finds, "consciousness come into being (*sambhūti*), by dependence on a duality. What is that duality? Owing to the eye and objects arises eye-

consciousness. The eye is impermanent, changing, - its state is 'becoming otherness.' So also are objects. Thus this dual, mobile and transitory, impermanent, changing, its state is 'becoming otherness.' Eye-consciousness is impermanent, changing, - its state is 'becoming otherness.' That condition, that relation of the uprising of eye-consciousness, - they also are impermanent, changing its state is 'becoming otherness.' This eye-consciousness, arising as it does from an impermanent relation, - how could it be permanent? Now the striking together, the falling together, the meeting together of these three things, - this is called 'eye-contact (*phassa*).' Eye-contact is impermanent, changing, - its state is 'becoming otherness.' That condition, that relation of the uprising of eye-contact, - they also are impermanent, changing its state is 'becoming otherness.' This eye-contact, arising as it does from an impermanent relation, - how could it be permanent? It is one touched by contact that feels (*vedeti*), likewise who chooses (*ceteti*), likewise who perceives (*sañjānāti*); so these transient, fugitive *Dhammas* too, (namely, feeling, choice and perception) are impermanent, changing. Their state is 'becoming otherness.' The same treatment is accorded to ear-sounds, nose-odors, tongue-savors, body-tangible and mind-mental state."[38]

Buddhist humanism pointed out that all formations are subject to dissolution, if a man sees as impermanent the eye, which is impermanent, he has right view. The *Bahudhātuka Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* says, "It is impossible, it cannot come to pass that a man possessed of (right) view should go to any construction as permanent- this situation does not occur."[39] In *Aṅguttara Nikāya* it adds "formations are impermanent, thus unstable, thus insecure are all compounded things. Be ye dissatisfied with them, be ye repelled by them, be ye utterly free from them."[40]

The reality of impermanence means that discernment of the transient nature of all compounded things as they

really are. It is the basic nature of the worlds without any exception.

"Impermanent are all component things
They arise an cease that is their nature;
They come into being and pass away,
Release from them is bliss supreme"
(aniccā vatta sankharā-upādda vaya dhammino uppajjitvā nirujjhanti-tesam vūpassmo sukho). [41]

In a process the nature of world the law of impermanence (*anicca*) possesses almost in every component of thing. This is contrary to externalism (*sassatvāda*), which is misconception of the nature of empirical world. The *Brahmajāla Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* refers to ten variations on the doctrine of externalism, which is refuted by empiric knowledge and analysis. On the other hand it rejects the other extreme, which was presented by materialists, the annihilationism (*ucchadavāda*). The repudiation of both this extreme finds in the following words of the Buddha: "This world, Kaccāyana usually bases (its view) on two things: on existence (*sassatvāda*) and on non-existence (*ucchadavāda*). Now whoever with right insight sees the uprising of the world as it really is, does not hold with the non-existence of the world. But he, who with right insight sees the passing away of the world as it really is, does not hold with the existence of the world."[42]

In other words, there is only arising (*uppāda*) and passing away (*vaya*), a continual state of flux. The optimist may only see the world as constant becoming. The pessimist may be engrossed with the constant pass away but Buddhist objectivity provides us a picture of a continuously changing universe as flux that flows through all nature, both animate and inanimate. The Buddhist humanism said everything is arising from conditional causation in the domination of

process Cause and Effect. The Buddha used the word *'nadisotoviya'* (flowing stream) to express a flux of cause and effect that is constantly changing. It flows so continuously that man finds it hard to perceive a break. The doctrine of causality and conditionality also says to us that the necessary to avoid of the both extreme of determinism and indeterminism which lead to no room for free will and responsibility.

The world of phenomenon is brought impermanent characteristic *'yam kinci samudaya dhammam sabbam tam nirodha dhammam'* (whatever of the nature of arising has the nature of ceasing). They appear and disappear, making way for another to succeed.

The second basic characteristic of the world of experience is namely unsatisfactoriness (*dukkha*) or subject to conflict. It is a logical corollary arising from the law of impermanence. It cannot find permanent happiness in the impermanent nature of everything. Whatever is transient is also lead to fact unsatisfactory *yad aniccam tam dukkham* since every form of *samsaric* existence is impermanent, unsatisfactoriness, and imperfection. In *Visuddhimagga* Buddhaghosa recognizes the existing of unsatisfactoriness in the process of change when he explains *dukkha* (unsatisfactoriness) as three fold namely *dukkha-dukkha* (*dukkha* as suffering), *viparināmadukkha* (*dukkha* as change) and *saṇkhāra-dukkha* (*dukkha* as conditioned state).[43] In the *Dhammapāda* Buddha said, "Transient are all component things; when this with wisdom, one discerns, then one is disgusted with unsatisfactoriness: this is the path to purity" (*sabbe saṅkhārā aniccā ti yadā pāññāpassati, atha nibbindati dukkha: esa maggo visuddhiyā*).[44]

The third basic characteristic of all phenomena is called *anattā* (non-substantial). It means that everything in this world is not only to subject continually change, but also the

focus of Non-substantial. The existence of world is the chain of evens that combined from component things. Unbelievable as it seems, this body, this appears to be solid and permanent, is in actual fact composed of sub-atomic particles that are changing at every second. Not only did the Buddha declare that all conditioned phenomena were impermanent, but by analyzing the self-possessing in each being. Buddha also realized that there was no permanent entity called self. All that existed was an ever-changing process.

The discourses of the theory of *anattā* (non-substantial) succinctly stated, "The eye (ear, nose, tongue, body and mind and their six external objects) is impermanence; what is impermanent is fraught with sorrow; what is fraught with sorrow is not 'self' or, 'All is not self'. And, what is the all that is not self? The eye is not self, etc...."[45] or "All things (*dhammā*) are non-self."[46] The concept of Egolessness (*anattā*) In the commentary *Paṭisanbhidāmagga*[47] is said that human existence is only a composite of the five aggregates or constituents (*khandhas*) corporeality or physical form (*rūpa*), feelings or sensations (*vedanā*), perceptions (*saññā*), mental formations or dispositions (*sankhāra*) and consciousness (*viññāṇa*) none of which is the self or soul. In a process of continuous change, the *khandhas* themselves are not enduring, but are series of momentary events, each such event standing in a casual relationship to next. While there is thus a flux of constantly changing factors in any given empirical 'individual.' If the world were substance the impact of change would not influence on the constituent of things; everything could not change from this state to other state and that it is contrary with the nature of world.

Objections on Psychological Grounds

Under the light of Buddhist humanism, the world is

known based on *Nāma* and *Rūpa* that are absolute realities (*paramattha dhammas*). *Nāmas* are mental phenomena that dividing two kinds of *Citta* (consciousness) and *Cetasika* (mental factors arising together with consciousness). *Rūpas* are physical phenomena. In other words, the term *Paramattha Dhammas* in the *Abhidhamma Piṭṭaka* deals with the four truths of consciousness (*citta*), psychic factor (*cetasika*), matter (*rūpa*) and eternalbliss (*Nibbāna*). The three first truths of consciousness (*citta*), psychic factor (*cetasika*), matter (*rūpa*) is called conditioned *Dhammas* (*sankhāra dhammas*) in the existence. The world arises or falls because of conditions. It is different from *Nibbāna* (eternalbliss) is unconditioned *Dhammas* (*asankhāra dhammas*).

Consciousness (*citta*)

Citta of the worldly individual is constantly throbbing, trembling and wavering (*phandanaṃ capalaṃ cittaṃ*).[48] It is exceedingly difficult to be protested and to be saved from falling into moral lapse (*durakkhaṃ dunnivārayaṃ*: loc. cit.). It quivers like a fish out of water distracted by a multiplicity of stimuli (*Vārijo'va thale khitto akamokata-ubbhato, pariphandatidaṃ cittaṃ*).[49] It is verily hard to control, assuredly light and quick and attaching itself to whatever it craves (*dunniggaha, lahu, yatthakāma nipāti*).[50] It is difficult to be seen or understood and very subtle (*sududdasa, sunipuna*).[51] It travels far, fares alone is incorporeal and resident in the cave of the heart (*dūraṅgama, ekacara, asarīra, guhāsaya*).[52] The Buddha says, "I know not of any other single thing so quick to change as the mind: insomuch that there it is no easy thing to illustrate how quick to change it is" (*Nāhaṃ bhikkhave aññam ekadhammam pi samanupassāmi yam evaṃ lahuparivattaṃ yathāyidaṃ cittaṃ yāvañcidaṃ bhikkhave upamā pi na sukarā yāva lahuparivattaṃ cittaṃ ti*).[53] "Just as a monkey faring through the dense forest catches one bough and letting it go, catches another, and then another, even so, monks, with what is

called thought or mind or consciousness, by day as night, one arises when another perishes."[54]

Citta, in the view of Buddhist humanism, is thus a series of events in an incessant process of mentation. *Citta* as a unitary term is nothing more than a convenient collective noun to comprehend a wide and complex nexus of mental states in flux. British empiricist philosopher, David Hume: "The mind or self is nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions, which succeed each other with an inconceivable rapidity, and are in a perpetual flux and movement."[55]

In the Early Buddhist Psychology, the *Pāli* term *citta, mano* and *viññāṇa* are used as synonymously.[56] The term *mano* may thus to said to represent the rational faculty of man, that is, the intellectual functioning of his consciousness; the term *viññāṇa* represents the field of sense and sense-reaction, that is the sphere of sensory and perceptive activity (*vijānātī ti kho bhikhave tasmā viññāṇaṃ ti vuccati*).[57]

According to *Dhammasangani, citta* (consciousness) is given by total of sense perceptions (*dvipanacaviññanāṃ-manodhātu*) (i.e. two recipient consciousnesses and one consciousness at the five sense doors and remaining seventy-six consciousness (*manoviññānadhātu*).[58] Buddhaghosa has been given the appropriate definition of consciousness "*Citta* is, that which thinks about object."[59] There are six kinds of the objects: *rūpa* (visible), *sadda* (audible), *gandha* (odors), *rasa* (taste), *phoṭṭhabba* (tangible) and *dhamma* (ideational). *Citta* does not automatically begin to think these objects rather there are certain factors named sense organs helps consciousness (*citta*) in process of thinking about the objects. These sense organs are eye (*cakkhu*), ear (*sota*), nose (*ghāna*), tongue (*jivhā*), body (*kāya*) and mind. These sense doors which receive these objects mentioned above) and carries their information to the consciousness (*citta*) and sense organ

is a must for knowing or thinking about an object. Consciousness cannot see a form without eye and eye cannot perceive a form without consciousness (*cittaṃ rūpaṃ na passati acakkhukatā, cakkhuṃ pi rupaṃ na passati acittakatā*). Consciousness is a mental unit, which thinks about the object (*ālambana*) with the help of sense organ.

Considered functionally *citta* has been subjected to a three-fold classification represented by the distinction between the affective (*vedanā*), cognitive (*saññā*) and the conation (*cetanā*). These three aspects do not of course function separately. As mental processes all three aspects operate all at once by way of concurrent action and inter-action. The *Saṁyutta Nikāya* alone records over thirty different functions. Perhaps, the most pre-eminent function of the mind, in relation to the worldly individual and society, consists in its ideological leadership. Says the Buddha: "The world is led by thought, by thought it is drawn along. When thought has arisen, it goes under its sway." (*cittena kho bhikkhave loko niyyati, cittena parikassati, cittassa uppannassa vasaṃ gacchati*)[60]

Citta is not a metaphysical entity in the sense in which the latter is defined as a thing's existence as opposed to its qualities and relations. *Citta* including under the generic term *Dhamma* that is to say of the five aggregates of grasping (*pañcupādānakkhandhā*) arise in variably as a result of the collocation of a wide variety of causal factor (*paṭiccasamuppannā kho panime yadidaṃ pañcupādānakkhadhā*).[61] The Buddha has in various ways spoken of the dependent origination of the mind and has also stated that there is no arising of the mind except through the collocation of cause factors (*anekapariyāyena h'āvuso sāti paṭiccasamuppannaṃ viññānaṃ vuttaṃ bhagavatā: aññatra paccayā natthi viññāṇassa sambhavo*).[62]

There are many different types of *citta*, which can be

classified in different ways. On the basis of the root (*hetu*), the consciousness is of two types, namely, consciousness associated with roots (*sahetuka-citta*) is of six types greed (*lobha*), ill-will (*dosa*), delusion (*moha*), non-greed (*alobha*), friendliness (*adosa*) and knowledge (*amoha*). And consciousness dissociated with root (*ahetuka-citta*) is not associated with any one of them.

Classification of *citta* based on the considerations from the standpoint of class (*jāti*), the eighty-nine *citta* (consciousness) is generally classified three divisions: twelve distinct types of *citta* described as immoral consciousness (*akusala-citta*), twenty-one types as moral consciousness (*kusala-citta*) and fifty-six types as unmoral consciousness (*abyākata-citta*) which consists of thirty-six resultants (*vipāka*) and twenty inoperative (*kriyā*) consciousnesses.

Another way of classifying *citta* is by plane of consciousness (*bhumi*), the *citta* (consciousness) is of four spheres, namely, the sensuous consciousness (*kāmāvacara-citta*), form-consciousness (*rūpāvacara-citta*), formless-consciousness (*ārūpāvacara-citta*), supramundane-consciousness (*lokuttara-citta*) - (*Tattha cittaṃ tāva catubbidhaṃ hoti: kāmāvacaraṃ, rūpāvacaraṃ, ārūpāvacaraṃ, lokuttarañcāti*).[63] (1) ***Kāmāvacara-citta*** (the sphere of sensuous consciousness) consists of fifty-four types of which twelve are immoral consciousness (*akusala-citta*), eighteen are moral consciousness (*kusala-citta*) and twenty-four are good-consciousness (*sobbhana-citta*). Of the twelve types of *akusala-citta* (immoral consciousness), eight are rooted in greed, two in ill-will and the remaining two in ignorance and delusion. There are eighteen types of *citta* without root of which seven are immoral resultants, eight are moral resultants and three are inoperative. There are twenty-four types of good-consciousness of which eight are moral, eight are resultant, and eight are inoperative. (2) ***Rūpāvacara-citta*** (the sphere of form-consciousness) consists of fifteen types of which five

are moral, five are resultant and five are inoperative. (3) ***Ārūpāvacara-citta*** (the sphere of formless-consciousness) there is twelve types of which four are moral, four are resultant and four are inoperative. (4) ***Lokuttara-citta*** (the sphere of transcendental consciousness) there is eight types of which four are moral and four are resultant. Thus, in all there are eighty-nine types of *citta* which are again classified in hundred and twenty-on types after further elaboration.

Psychic Factors of Consciousness (*cetasika*)

The psychic factor of consciousness (*Pāli: Cetasika; Skt: Caitasika, Caitta*) in psychological analysis of Buddhist humanism is group of all aspects of mentation considered variously as psychic function-events, mental co-efficient, mental concomitants, mental constituents, mental factors, mental adjuncts, mental elements, mental faculties, etc. *Cetasikas* share the same object with the *citta*, but they each have their own specific quality and function. Some *cetasikas* arise with every *citta* whereas others do not. In the *Kathāvaṭṭhu* of *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* mentioned the definition of the term with new technical signification as "mental phenomena which are concomitant, co-existent, conjoined with consciousness have their genesis and cessation, physical basis and object in common with it" (*dhammā cittena sahagatā sahajātā saṃsaṭṭhā sampayuttā ekuppādā ekanirodhā ekavatthukā ekārammaṇā*).[64] Anuruddha defined that mental factors are those that arise and cease together with consciousness and share the same object and basis with consciousness (*ekuppādanirodhā ca ekālambanavatthukā cetayutta dhammā cetasikā matā*).[65] *Cetasika*, in more specific significance, denotes one of the classes of ultimate elements of existence into which the universe is objectively considered a species under the genus *Dhamma*. It cannot arise individually or independently. It always arises with the consciousness and comes to existence simultaneously with the arising of a consciousness

and is conditioned by its presence.[66] There are four characteristics of psychic factors (*cetasika*) namely, arising with the consciousness, ceasing with the consciousness, having the same object, having the same base.

In *Nikāya Suttas* all mental states are called not *cetasikas* (psychic factors) but *Dhammas*. The word *Dhamma* is, of course, used in a wide variety of senses already but its application to mean objects of mind. The analytical origin of *cetasikas* (psychic factors) is resulting from the fundamentally anti-metaphysical of the Buddha into the causality and conditionality of existence including mentation. Consistent with this sight, life is understood to be in constant flux and the belief in a soul as a changeless substance is discarded as a myth effectively preventing insight into reality as it is.[67] Accordingly the mind itself is recognized in a dynamic sense. Consciousness as a process of awareness is seen to be nothing more than a collocation of cause factors (*aññatra paccayā natthi viññāṇassa sambhavo*).[68] This non-substantialist teaching encouraged among the Buddha's disciples a genuine and serious interest in the critical observation, investigation and analysis of the data of psychological life. The function of the religious life, at the contemplative level, was itself defined as the choiceless awareness of the nascence, persistence and essence of the multitude of mental states that arise in consciousness at different stage of ecstatic development. The *Anupada Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* which may be considered the earliest literary source of *cetasikas*, quotes the Buddha commending Sāriputta for exercises in introspective awareness of mental phenomena as follows: "Here, monks, Sāriputta, aloof from pleasures of the senses, unskilled state of mind enters on and abides in the first meditation which is accompanied by initial thought and discursive thought, is born of aloofness, and is rapturous and joyful. And those mental state which belong to the first meditation: initial thought (*vitakka*), sustained thought (*vicāra*), rapture (*pīti*),

joy (*sukha*), one-pointedness of mind (*cittekaggatā*), impingement (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā*), perception (*saññā*), will (*cetanā*), desire (*chanda*), determination (*adhimokkha*), energy (*viriya*), mindfulness (*sati*), equanimity (*upekkhā*), attention (*manasikāra*) are uninterruptedly set up by him; known to him these things arise, known they persist, known they disappear. He comprehends thus: Thus indeed things that have not been in me come to be; having been they pass away. He, not feeling attracted by these states, not feeling repelled, independent, not infatuated, freed, released, dwells with a mind that is unconfined. He comprehends: There is a further escape."[69] This intensive culture of introspective awareness brought to light a wide variety of mental states, which then had to be names, and classified and the suttas bear witness to the multifarious ways means devised by the ancient teachers for this purpose. This wealth of data, which in the later *Abhidhamma* was neatly and conveniently classified under the generic term *cetasika* (psychic factor of consciousness) is found scattered in the *Nikāyas* listed under a wide variety of overlapping classifications including *khandha* (aggregation),[70] *āyatana* (sphere of sense-perception),[71] *dhātu* (the physical elements),[72] *indriya* (controlling principle or sense-faculty),[73] *bala* (power or force),[74] *nīvaraṇa* (an obstacle or hindrance),[75] *saṃyojana* (fetter),[76] *kilesa* (defilement or impurity),[77] *mūla* (condition),[78] *jhāna* (meditation),[79] *magga* (path),[80] and *brahmavihāra* (sublime state of mind).[81]

The elements of mind and matter have lent themselves in Buddhist thought to classification under two distinct types, namely, the subjective and objective. The categories of *khandha* (aggregation), *āyatana* (sphere of sense-perception) and *dhātu* (the physical elements) constitute subjective classifications of the component parts of a personality.[82] The classification of *cetasikas* (psychic factors of consciousness) into distinct classes and sub-classes was beyond the scope

of the *khandhas* (aggregation), which were, but aggregates. Moreover, the *khandha* (aggregation) classification could accommodate only three distinct *cetasikas* (psychic factor of consciousness), namely, feeling perception and will under the *vedanākkhandha* (feeling-aggregate), *saññākkhandha* (perception-aggregate) and *sankhārakkhandha* (the aggregate of mental coefficients) respectively. The categories of *āyatana* (sphere of sense-perception) and *dhātu* (the physical elements) were found to be equally ill-equipped to handle the classification of the growing number of *cetasikas* (factor of consciousness) for these had all to be dumped indiscriminately either under *Dhammadhātu* (the mental object considered as irreducible element) as objects of *Manodhātu* (element of apprehension or the ideational faculty). The inadequacy of these categories was increasingly realized as the interest of the Buddhist psychologists shifted gradually from subjective to objective classification of all phenomena, both physical and mental.

According to *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, the fifty-two *cetasika* (of consciousness) [83] have mainly been classified under following three kinds of psychic factors viz. general psychic factor of consciousness (*aññasamāna-cetaska*), immoral psychic factor of consciousness (*akusala-cetasika*), and moral psychic factor of consciousness (*sobhana-cetasika*). (1) ***Aññasamāna-cetasika*** (the general psychic factors of consciousness) refers to both moral and immoral there are thirteen types of *cetasika* of which seven are the universal factors (*sabbacitta sadhāraṇā cetasika*) and six are particular psychic factor (*pakiṇṇakā-cetasika*). The universal psychic factors, which are associated with each types of the consciousness, consist of *phassa* (mental contact), *vedanā* (feeling), *saññā* (perception), *cetanā* (volition), *ekaggatā* (one-pointedness), *jīvitindriya* (psychic life), *manasikāra* (attention). These seven factors are present in all the types of thoughts and are therefore called the primary psychological factors.

Of these factors *phassa* (mental contact) is bare awareness of the presence of an object; *vedanā* (feeling) is the feeling tone which makes sensation agreeable, disagreeable or neutral; *saññā* (perception) is the recognition of an object, following on its bare awareness through *phassa; cetanā* (volition) here is devoid of ethical value, for it indicates volition determined by the factor that delimits the of object of consciousness, thus playing a negative role in eliminating what is not in sensory focus. *Jivitindriya* (psychic life) is the factor that makes possible psychic life and unites all other factors are by themselves neutral in the moral sense, yet they are capable of becoming morally decisive factors depending upon whether they are associated with wholesome or unwholesome states of consciousness. The particular psychic factors have been called because they are not to be regarded as universal. It may be commonly present in all thè classes of consciousness but not in all types. The particular psychic factors consist of *vitakka* (initial-application of thought), *vicāra* (sustained-application of thought), *adhimokkha* (decision), *viriya* (energy), *pīti* (rapture) and *chanda* (conation). (2) ***Akusala-cetasika*** (in immoral psychic factor of consciousness) there is fourteen types of which four are immoral universals (*sabbākusala-sadhāraṇā*) and ten are the subsidiary immoral factors. The primary immoral factors found invariably in all classes of immoral consciousness are four in number: *moha* (delusion), *ahirika* (shamelessness), *anottappa* (restlessness) and *uddhacca* (distraction). *Moha* (delusion) is one of the immoral root-causes. It prevents one seeing the unworthiness of one's behavior in thought, speech and deed and this makes one shameless; further, delusion prevents one from perceiving the consequences of such unworthy behavior and this makes one unscrupulous. The lack of security and balance resulting from these makes one constantly restless and distracted. This truth clarifies the universality of these four factors in all classes and types of

immoral consciousness. The subsidiary immoral factors consist of *dosa* (hate), *issā* (envy), *macchariya* (meanness), *kukkucca* (worry), *lobha* (greed), *diṭhi* (erroneous views), *māna* (cenceit), *thīna* (sloth), *middha* (torpor) and *vicikicchā* (perplexity). These immoral factors do not occur in all immoral classes of consciousness. The six states of consciousness envy, jealousy, worry, conceit, sloth and torpor are considered as major object in arising of the immoral consciousness. (3) ***Sobhana-cetasika*** (in moral psychic factor of consciousness) there is twenty-five types of which nineteen are the good universals psychic factors (*sobhanasādhāraṇa*) and six are supplemental factors (*pakiṅṅakā*). The good universals psychic factors consist of *saddhā* (confidence), *sati* (mindfulness), *hiri* (shame), *ottappa* (scrupulousness), *alobha* (detachment), *adosa* (goodwill), *tatramajjhattatā* (equanimity), *kāya-passaddhi* (calmness of mind), *kāya-lahutā* (buoyancy of psychic factors), *citta-lahutā* (buoyancy of mind), *kāya-mudutā* (pliancy of psychic factors), *citta-mudutā* (pliancy of mind), *kāya-kaṃmaññatā* (fitness of psychic facṭors), *citta-kammaññatā* (fitness of mind), *kāya-pāguññatā* (proficiency of psychic factors), *citta-pāguññatā* (proficiency of mind) *kāya-ujjukatā* (rectitude of psychic factors), and *citta-ujjukatā* (rectitude of mind). The supplemental psychic factors consist of *sammā-vācā* (right speech), *sammā-kammanta* (right action), *sammā-ājīva* (right livelihood), *karuṇā* (compassion), *muditā* (sympathetic joy), *paññā* (wisdom). The first three of these good factors listed here reconsidered negatively, as refraining from false speech, action and livelihood, and are on this ground called the abstinences (*viratiyo*). Since compassion and joy are spread over all beings of the universe they are called the illimitableness (*appamaññā*). These abstinences and illimitableness are considered as 'inconstancy' in view of their occasional and singular occurrence. The last of the secondary factors here, namely, *paññā* (wisdom), is

enlightened reason considered as the guiding principle of the mind.

Although *citta* (consciousness) and *cetasika* (psychic factor of consciousness) are both mentality (*nāma*), they each have different characteristics. One may wonder how *cetasikas* can be experienced. When man notices a change in *citta* (consciousness), a characteristic of *cetasika* (psychic factor of consciousness) can be experienced. For instance, when *akusala cittas* with stinginess arise after *kusala cittas* with generosity have fallen away, we can notice a change. Stinginess and generosity are *cetasikas*, which can be experienced; they have different characteristics. Man may notice as well the change from attachment to aversion, from pleasant feeling to unpleasant feeling. Feeling is a *cetasika* (psychic factor of consciousness) man cans experiences, because feeling is sometimes predominant and there are different kinds of feeling. We can experience that unpleasant feeling is different from pleasant feeling and from indifferent feeling. These different *cetasikas* arise with different *cittas* (consciousness) and they fall away immediately, together with the *citta* (consciousness) they accompany. If we know more about the variety of *citta* (consciousness) and *cetasika* (psychic factor of consciousness), which it will help one own to see the truth. Since *citta* (consciousness) and *cetasika* (psychic factor of consciousness) arise together it is difficult to experience the difference in their characteristics. The Buddha was able to directly experience the different characteristics of all *cittas* (consciousness) and *cetasikas* (psychic factor of consciousness) because his wisdom was of the highest degree. Man reads in the Questions of King Milinda that the Nagasena said to King Milinda: "A hard thing there is, O King, which the Blessed One has done. And what is that? The fixing of all those mental conditions, which depend on one organ of sense, telling us that such is contact, such, is feeling (*vedanā*), such is perception (*saññā*), such is

volition and such is *citta*. - Give me an illustration. - Suppose, O King, a man were to wade down into the sea, and taking some water in the palm of his hand, were to taste it with his tongue. Would he distinguish whether it were water from the Ganges, or from the *Jamuna*, or from the *Aciravati*, or from the *Sarabhu*, or from the *Mahi*? -Impossible, Sir. - More difficult than that, great King, is it to have distinguished between the mental conditions, which follow on the exercise of any one of the organs of sense!" [84]

Rūpa or Material Quality

The view of *Vibhāvinitikā*[85] states *rūpa* (matter) is that which transforms or assumes a different mode owing to the adverse conditions of cold, heat etc. Further the *Visudhimagga* says that the state, which has the characteristic of '*rūppāna*' due to cold and heat etc., should be understood as *rūpa*.[86] Here the characteristic of *rūppāna* indicates is the quality of molestation, vexation or trouble, which is established or changed by external seasonal changes.[87] It is also defined as *"rūppati ti tasmā rūpaṃ ṭi vuccatti kena rūppati? Sitena unhenādi."*[88] It shows that matter or material quality is the name of the *Dhammas* that do not continue in a particular form and color but undergoes changes according to the various changes in the external condition. Hence *rūpa* comprehends in a generic way all the elements that constituting the physical object of sensation and perception that appear as the surrounding world in a state of continuous flux. According to *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha* of B. Anuruddhacariya, there are eleven kinds of *rūpa*, which is classified two parts of: one *bhūta-rūpa* (primary matter) and ten *upādāya-rūpa* (derivatives matter).[89] From these eleven kinds of *rūpa*, it is divided into twenty-eight types in detail. (1) ***Bhūta-rūpa*** refers to the basic material qualities, which consists of elements (*dhātu*) of earth (*pathavī-dhātu*), as well

as the elements of water (*āpo-dhātu*), fire (*tejo-dhātu*) and wind (*vāyo-dhātu*). These four types of elements are considered as simple primary *Dhammas* of materiality, each one carrying its own specific kind of activity which establishing the basis for each one of the fundamental states for character of the appearing things in the material world. ***Upādāya-rūpa*** refers to those matters which arises on the basis of afore four *mahābhūta*. *Upādāya-rūpa* (derivatives matter) includes in ten kinds of twenty-four types in detail: (2) *Pasāda-rūpa* is the five subjective of sensitive material qualities, namely, *cakkhu* (eye), *sota* (ear), *ghāna* (nose), *jivhā* (tongue) and *kāyā* (body). Five sense organs generically constituted by the subtle and 'translucent'; (3) *Gocara-rūpa* is the five objections of sensitive material qualities, namely, *rūpa* (form), *sadda* (sound), *gandha* (smell or odor), *rasā* (taste) and *phoṭabba* (touch). Five coarse and 'opaque' sense matters derived from the four primary elements in the state of unbalance. Here it only mentions to four types because touch (*phoṭabba*) plays primary elements; (4) *Bhāva-rūpa* is of two types *Iṭṭhata* (feminity) and *Purisatta* (masculinity); (5) *Hadaya-rūpa* is the substance of the mind;(6) *Jīvita-rūpa* is the faculty of life, vitality;(7) *Āhāra-rūpa* refers to gross food which is taken in by making into marvels morsels; (8) *Pariccheda-rūpa* is the element of space (*ākāsa*); (9) *Viññatti-rūpa* is of two types namely *kāya-viññatti* and *vaci-viññatti;* (10) *Vikāra-rūpa* refers to the state or conditions of matter. It is of the three types namely, *rūpassa-lahūtā* (lightness), *rūpassa-mudutā* (verify) and *rūpassa-kamaññatā* (adaptability); (11) *Lakkhaṇa-rūpa* refers to assume distinguishable characteristic at different stage such as arising (*uppāda*), static (*ṭhiti*) and dissolution (*bhaṅga*). There are four types of *Lakkhaṇa-rūpa* namely, *rūpassa-upacayo, rūpassa-santati, rūpassa-jaratā* and *rūpassa-aniccatā* (i.e.-material quality of productivity, continuity, decay and impermanence respectively).

NATURE OF MAN

Reality of Suffering

One of the main characteristic existences of the nature of man is to seek pleasure or happiness or recoil from pain or a source of unhappiness (*sukhakama hi manussa dukkha patikkula*); again, man naturally 'desires to live but not to die' (*jivitukama amaritukama*). The term '*dukkha*' has been used in Buddhist humanism to convey the totality of experiences of human being in the world, which represents in the First Noble Truth of the Buddha as deeper philosophical meaning and connotes enormously wider senses. The term '*dukkha*' is used to the meaning of unsatisfaction or suffering, but in addition it also includes deeper ideas, such as 'imperfection', 'impermanence', 'emptiness', 'insubstantiality.' It is difficult, therefore, to find one word to embrace the whole conception of the term *dukkha*.

Dukkha (suffering) is of different types and intensities. For example the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*[90] speaks of excessive *dukkha* and trifling *dukkha* and *dukkha* that is slow to change and quick to change. The *Saṁyutta Nikāya*[91] refers to a better known three-fold division: (i) *Dukkha-dukkha*: the sort of suffering caused by pain (ii) *Vipariṇāma-dukkha*: the sort of suffering caused by the changeable nature of things, and (iii) *Saṅkhara-dukkha*: the sort of suffering caused by the activities. In the *Visuddhimagga* [92] it explains in detail as following:

- ***Dukkha-dukkha*** (intrinsic suffering): It is so-called because of their individual essence, their name and painfulness.
- ***Vipariṇāma-dukkha*** (suffering in change): It explains that physical and mental pleasant feelings are called because they cause the arising of suffering when they change.

> ***Saṅkhāra dukkha*** (suffering due to formation): Equanimous feeling (*upekkhā*) and the remaining formations of the three planes are called because they are subject to rise and fall.

Besides the commentary *Visuddhimagga* (loc. cit.) mentions to other divisions of *dukkha* (suffering). Such bodily and mental affliction as earache, toothache, fever born of lust, fever born of hate, etc., is called concealed suffering (*paṭicchanna dukkha* or *apākaṭadukkha*); it is also called unevident suffering. Afflictions produced by torture etc. are grouped under exposed or evident suffering (*pākaṭa* or *appaṭicchanna dukkha*); it is called evident suffering. Buddhaghosa identifies intrinsic dukkha with direct *dukkha* (*nippariyāya dukkha*). All in the exposition of *dukkha* beginning with 'birth' (*jati*) are called indirect *dukkha* (*pariyāya dukkha*) (except intrinsic *dukkha*) because they form the basis for one kind of *dukkha* or another.

What is the meaning Noble Truth of suffering (*dukkha*)? In the first discourse to the first five disciples (*pañcavaggiyā bhikkhu*)[93] the Buddha says, "And this, monk, is the Noble Truth of suffering: birth is suffering, old age is suffering, disease is suffering and dying is suffering, association with what is not dear is suffering, separation from what is dear is suffering, not getting what one wants is suffering-in short the five aggregates of grasping (*panca-upadanakkhandha*) are suffering."[94] This element of *dukkha* contains of thirteen different items in *Nikāya* literature. These are (1) birth (*jāti*), (2) ageing (*jarā*), (3) disease (*vyādhi*), (4) dying (*maraṇa*), (5) grief (*domanassa*), (6) lamentation (*parideva*), (7) pain (*dukkha*), (8) sorrow (*soka*); (9) tribulations (*upāyāsa*), (10) association with persons and things which are not dear (*appiyehi sampayoga*), (11) dissociation from persons and things which are dear (*piyehi vippayoga*), (12) not getting what one desires (*yam pi iccham na labhati tam*) and finally (13) the five groups of grasping (*pañcupādānakkhandhā*).[95]

The detailed explanations of these definition *dukkha* are found in the *Visuddhimagga*.[96] It takes item-by-item (*vyādhi*) is omitted in this enumeration) and discusses how these either cause or lead to or consist of *dukkha*. Explaining 'birth' (*jāti*) it describes the nauseating conditions under which the fetus; exists in the mother's womb, suffering it undergoes while being there, as for example being burnt when the mother is consuming anything hot etc. and also the pain the new-born as well as the mother suffers at the time of birth. Discussing 'decay or growing old' (*jarā*) Buddhaghosa points out how ageing brings about disappearance of youth and leads to death, how senility and debility cause both physical and mental suffering, Buddhaghosa attempts to show the difference among sorrow (*soka*), lamentation (*parideva*), grief (*domanassa*) and tribulations (*upāyāsa*). He says *soka* is a sort of burning in the mind in one who is affected by loss of relatives and so on. Although in meaning it is same as *domanassa,* he points out that *soka* has inner consuming as its characteristic, whereas *domanassa* has distressing of the mind as its characteristic. Very correctly he explains *parideva* (lamentation) as external manifestation of *dukkha* both physical and mental, demonstrated by crying and lamentation. *Upāyāsa* (tribulations) he describes as a form of *dukkha* in which *soka* (sorrow), *parideva* (lamentation) and *domanassa* (grief) are all combined in a somewhat subdued manner. The item *dukkha* in this list is taken to be physical pain, which consequently causes mental anguish,[97] and this is contrasted with *domanassa* (grief), The remaining instances of ordinary *dukkha* namely association with persons and things which are not dear, dissociation from persons and things which are dear, not getting what one desires all cause mental anguish. The last item '*saṃkhittena pañcupādāna-kkhandhā pi dukkha*' (in brief the five aggregates of clinging are suffering), according to Buddhaghosa it appears as a summary of the whole definition in a philosophical tone.

From thirteen different items of suffering or unsatisfactoriness (*dukkha*) as described in the scriptures it can be recognized in aspect of physical meaning (birth, ageing, disease, death), as well as of psychological meaning (sorrow, lamentation, pain, grief, despair, association with persons and things which are not dear, dissociation from persons and things which are dear, not to obtain what one wants is suffering) and of doctrinal import (five aggregates of grasping). The doctrinal aspect of suffering is stated in brief in the discourse referring to five aggregates (*pañcupādānakkhandhā*) of grasping; namely: (i) grasping of materiality (*rūpa*), (ii) grasping of feeling (*vedanā upadana*), (iii) grasping of perception (*saññna upadana*), (iv) grasping of mental formation (*sankhara upadana*) and (v) grasping of consciousness (*viññaṇa upadana*). In other words, holding on to five constituent factors of empiric individuality, they are internal or external cause suffering. This is a very precise statement full of meaning covering all spheres of human life.

The Buddhist humanism explains 'the world is established on suffering' (*dukkhe laka paṭṭhito*).[98] The existence of *dukkha* (suffering) is the reality in their nature, not because the Buddha said they are suffering (*dukkha*). In general, suffering (*dukkha*) being the most elementary and universal fact of experience undergone by the vast majority of beings, the Buddha adopts it as the principle on which he bases his scheme of spiritual training leading to wisdom, which gives a clear understanding of life and the external world, enabling one to overcome suffering (*dukkha*).

The cause of suffering

Dukkha (suffering) embraces the whole of existence, whether sentient or non-sentient, animate or inanimate; like, or dislike, a pleasant or unpleasant condition or a neutral one, all come under *dukkha*. What is the Noble Truth of origin

of suffering? The Buddha teaches, " O monks, it is that craving which gives rise to fresh rebirth and bound up with lust and greed, now here, now there, finds ever fresh delight. It is the sensual craving, the craving for existence, and (even) the craving for self-annihilationWherever in the world there are the delightful and pleasurable forms, there this craving arises, there it takes its root Such is said, O monks, to be the Noble Truth of origin of suffering."[99] *Dukkha* is understood because it is changing constantly, all the time, at any moment. All those things, happy or suffering, they come and go, begin and end, the whole process of this world just operates in this way. For this very reason, the concept of suffering necessarily includes the general insecurity of the whole of our experience. The Buddha taught, 'whatever is impermanent or changing, all that is suffering' (*yad aniccam tam dukkham*). Before he said so he observed the whole world and found nothing but a process of change. So changing means the world. The very characteristic of our existence that remains there all the time is but change whether for better or for worse.

Addressing the first five monks the Buddha said *dukkha* is caused by wrong perception of the *pañcakkhandha*, which makes man becomes attached to them, is stated differently elsewhere. The *Saṁyutta Nikāya*[100] records a conversation between the Buddha and Anuruddha on this subject. The Buddha questions Anuruddha whether the five aggregates are permanent or not, to which tile latter answers in the negative. Then he asks Anuruddha whether what is impermanent is suffering (*dukkha*) or pleasant (*sukha*). The latter says it is *dukkha*.

To the analysis of Buddhist humanism the way *dukkha* (suffering) appearing in all human experience is through six sense doors of eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body and mind. If the object is pleasant, one is attracted and if unpleasant, one

is repelled. Thus, whatever kind of feeling (*vedanā*) – pleasant, painful or neutral – one approves of and cherishes the feeling, and lust of feelings, cling to existence (*upādāna*) that gives rise to suffering, conflict, unsatisfactoriness through process of sense perception and such types of mentally anguishing experiences connoted by the term *dukkha* (suffering). The process of sense perception is described in numerous places in the *Nikāyas*. Such as in the *Madhupiṇḍika Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* it analyzes "Depending eye and visible form arises visual consciousness meeting of the three is contact (*phassa*); because of contact arise feeling (*vedanā*) what one feels one perceives (*saññāti*); what one reflects on, one is obsessed with (*papañceti*); what one is obsessed with, due to that concepts characterized by such obsessed perceptions (*papañcasaññāsaṅkhā*) assails such a person with regard to visible forms cognizable by the eye, belonging to the past, future and the present."[101]

From this explanation it is very clear that the perceptual process starts on a very impersonal note and precedes so till the arising of feeling (*vedanā*). Feeling holds an important role in the subject-object relationship, but no at all. From his stage onwards up to the arising of obsessions (*papañca*) the process is controlled and guided by the ego-consciousness into the field of sense perception. These obsessions begin to operate the whole process of perception takes a totally new turn. They assail the subject who up to then shapes the perceptual process, subjugating him to an order of objective things and making him a hapless object. These obsessions are, according to the commentaries, craving (*taṇhā*), conceit (*māna*) and dogmatic views (*diṭṭhi*), which are three aspects of the ego-consciousness. A further analysis makes it clear that these are co-extensive with selfishness or egoism (*mamatta, asmimlina*) and belief in per-during self (*sakkāyadiṭṭhi*) that prompts one to view the five aggregates as 'this is mine' (*etaṃ mama*), 'this I am' (*eso' hamasmi*), 'this

is myself' (*eso me attā*). That is the ground the Buddha warns his disciples that "All those ascetics and *brahmins*, who again and again in manifold ways believe in an ego or the ego as the owner of that group. They all do so with regard to the five aggregates of existence, or to one of them. There the ignorant worldling considers, one of the five aggregates as the ego, or the ego as the owner of that aggregate, or that aggregates as included in the ego, or the ego as included in that aggregate."[102] In the other place of *Saṁyutta Nikāya* it mentions, "Body is not the self, and feeling, perception, the activitives, and consciousness is not the self. Impermanent are all compounded things. All conditions are not the self."[103] Human nature instincts desire for happiness and aversion to pain but the present of ego all sense data that one's sense-faculties receive from the world outside get an egoistic coloring, perverting his view. Thus mass of suffering can be arising.

What is conditioned by not self cannot be self. Matter, feeling (*rūpa, vedanā* etc.) are not self. The caused and condition for the arising of matter (etc.) are not self, so, it is asked, how could matter (etc.) which is brought into being by what is not self, be self.[104] Existence is nothing but existence depending on a series of conditions; hence their existence is a conditional one and there is nothing in the universe that is permanent, i.e., independent of conditions. All things matter and mind (*nāma-rūpa*), have no abiding self-reality. What appears to be real is a temporary existence, an instant in a conditional sequence, the effect of two or more conditions combined. In a conversation *Māra* (the Evil One) asks whom is the person (*satta*) produced. Who is the creator of the person? Where is the person who comes into being? Where is the person who disappears? The nun *Vajirā* points out to him that there is no such thing as a person but merely a collection of changing aggregates (*khandha*), and she illustrates her meaning by the simile of the chariot, which is

merely the name for a collection of various parts.[105] In the *Milindapañha*, the illustration is elaborated in great detail and it is pointed out that when giving him a name indicates a person, it does not denote a soul but is merely an appellation for the five aggregates, which constitute the empirical individual.[106]

The conceptions of individual are found further expanded. The human being was analyzed into its component parts, entered into relationship that replies on the groundwork of consciousness (*viññāṇa*), of cognitive faculties (*indriya*) and their objects. In other words, they are identified in relationship of *khandha* (aggregation), *āyatana* (sphere of sense-perception) and *dhātu* (the physical elements). The generic name for all three of them is *Dhamma*, which, in this context, is translated as 'element of existence.' Hence, the significance of the formula already referred to *sabbe dhammā anattā* (all existence is egolessness). When a man realizes that all these things (*dhammā*) are not the self,[107] he turns away from them and by the extinction of desire he attains released.

The absence in the human being of soul or ego doer not means that the Buddha taught the annihilation of body and mind at death. For, besides all the doctrines mentioned earlier, he also taught the doctrine of Action (*kamma*), the doctrine of the transmitted force of the action, both physical and mental. It is explained that the real connecting link between one existence and another is not the so-called 'ego' or any kind of soul substance. The Buddha has said, "This, O monks, is not your body, nor that of others. You have rather to see in it, monks, old deeds (*kamma*), and the result of actions, volitions and feelings in former existences."[108] The living being is a *khandha*-complex, ever changing, but ever determined by its antecedent actions. The long-drawn-out line of life is but a fluctuating curve of inner experience. The viewpoint of the Buddhist humanism, the personality is only

a bundle of elements (*sankhāra*) and a stream of successive states (*santāna*) originating and existing in-dependence on other, previous states. When he began this present life he brought as his inheritance the *kamma* (action) of his many previous lives. During the course of his existence in this world he is always accumulating fresh *kamma* (action), through his actions, his thoughts and desire, his affections and passions, and these affect every moment of his life, constantly changing its character. At death, when the corporeal bond, which held him together, falls away, he undergoes only a relatively deeper change. The unseen potencies of his *kamma* (action) beget a new person. His new body, determined by his *kamma* (action), becomes one fitted to that sphere [109] in which he is born. When a new life is thus produced its component elements are present from its very inception although in an undeveloped condition. The first moment of the new life is called *viññāṇa;* in the formula of the *paṭica-samuppāda* its antecedents are the *saṅkhara*, the prenatal forces, which contain latent in them the *anusaya*, the resultant of all the impressions made in that particular flux of elements (*santāna*), conventionally called an individual, in the whole course of its repeated births and deaths, its faring through life (*saṃsāra*). The wheel of existence (*bhavaca*) forming a circle (*maṇḍala*) that resembles a clock is depicted in twelve links of ignorance (*avidyā*), activities or *kammic* accumulation (*saṅkhāra*), consciousness (*viññāna*), mentality and corporeality (*nāma-rūpa*), the six organs (*saḷāyatana*), contact-impression (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā*), craving (*taṇhā*), attachment (*upādāna*), becoming (*kammabhava*), rebirth (*jati*), old age and death (*jarāmarapa*). The process is called happening when "conditioned by ignorance activities come to pass; conditioned by activities consciousness, conditioned by consciousness name-and-shape, conditioned by name-and-shape sense, conditioned by sense contact, conditioned by contact feeling, conditioned

by feeling craving, conditioned by craving grasping, conditioned by grasping becoming, conditioned by becoming birth, conditioned by birth old age-and death, grief, lamenting, suffering, sorrow, despair come and pass – even such is the uprising of this entire mass of ill." The process is called ceasing when "from the utter fading away and ceasing of ignorance (come) ceasing of activities; from ceasing of activities ceasing of consciousness; from ceasing of consciousness ceasing of name-and-shape; from ceasing of name-and-shape from ceasing of sense; from ceasing of sense ceasing of contact; from ceasing of contact ceasing of feeling; from ceasing of feeling ceasing of craving; from ceasing of craving ceasing of grasping; from ceasing of grasping ceasing of becoming; from ceasing of becoming ceasing of birth; from ceasing of birth ceasing of old age-and death, grief, lamenting, suffering, sorrow, despair cease – such is the ceasing of this entire mass of ill."[110] It is said the new process of person (*saṃsāra*), psychologically, if not physically, is continuous with the arising from craving (*taṇhā*) and attachment (*upādāna*). The elements that constitute the empirical individual are constantly changing but they will never totally disappear till the conditions and causes that hold them together and impel them to rebirth and the desire for separate existence, are finally extinguished. To emphasize the importance of chains of causality the Buddha says, "Whoever sees conditioned genesis (*paṭica-samuppāda*) sees *Dhamma*, whoever sees *Dhamma* see conditioned genesis."[111]

As long as there is this 'craving' to be and become, the cycle of continuity (*samsāra*) of suffering (*dukkha*) goes on. That is the ground why the Buddha say, "Verily it is the utter passionless cessation of, the giving up, the forsaking, the release from, the absence of longing for this craving (*tanhā*)."[112]

THE PATH CESSATION OF SUFFERING

The path of Four Noble Truths

For the path cessation of suffering, it is found the definition in the teaching of Buddha: "What, O monks, is the Noble Truth of the cessation of suffering? The utter fading away and cessation of that very craving, leaving it, giving it up, the being delivered from, the doing away with it Such is said, O monks, to be the Noble Truth of the cessation of suffering."[113]

The concept of Absolute Truth or *Nibbāna* in Four Noble Truths is emerged through the cutting off craving as it is mentioned of many places in *Nikāya* literature. For instance, *Saṁyutta Nikāya* has been pointed out "the tranquillization of all the activities of (worldly) life, the renunciation of all substrates of rebirth, the destruction of natural cravings, passionlessness, cessation, *Nibbāna*".[114] Or "It is the extinction of desire (*rāgakkhayo*), the extinction of hatred (*dosakkhayo*), and the extinction of illusion (*mohakkhayo*). This, O *bhikkhus*, is called the Absolute."[115] *Aṅguttara Nikāya* cites, "O *Bhikkhus*, whatever there may be things conditioned or unconditioned, among them detachment (*virāga*) is the highest. That is to say, freedom from conceit, destruction of craving, the uprooting of attachment, the cutting off of continuity, the extinction of craving (*tanhā*), detachment, cessation, *Nibbāna*."[116]

The important question here arise that what is the meaning of *Nibbāna*? According to Pali-English Dictionary the term *Nibbāna* (Skt: *nirvāṇa*) is composed of '*nis*' is meaning 'absence' and '*vana*' is a figurative expression of craving or lust. The meaning of *Nibbāna* is mentioned as, (a) the going out of a lamp or fire (popular meaning), (b) health, the sense of bodily well-being (probably, at first, the passing away of feverishness, restlessness), (c) the dying out in the heart of

the threefold fire of *rāga, dosa* and *moha*: lust, ill-will and stupidity (Buddhistic meaning), (d) the sense of spiritual well being, of security, emancipation, victory and peace, salvation, bliss.

Nibbāna is an unconditioned *Dhamma*. Because it is unconditioned, it does not arise, and therefore it does not fall away, not impermanent or marked by suffering, the Buddha says, "O *Bhikkhus*, there is the unborn, ungrown, and unconditioned. Were there not the unborn, ungrown and unconditioned, there would be no escape for the unborn, ungrown, and unconditioned. Since there is the unborn, ungrown, and unconditioned, so there is escape for the unborn, ungrown, and unconditioned."[117] *Nibbāna* as a matter of fact, "Here, the four elements of solidity, fluidity, heat and motion have no place; the notions of length and breadth, the subtle and the gross, good and evil, name and form are altogether destroyed; neither this world nor the other, nor sense-objects are to be found."[118] Or *Saṁyutta Nikāya* says, "The destruction of lust, the destruction of hatred, the destruction of illusion is called *Nibbāna*."[119]

For this view, some discussions occur among scholars. Such as Poussin says that '*Nibbāna* is annihilation'[120] or Burnouf speaks that *Nibbāna* is 'absolute nothing.'[121] Bishop Bigandet identifies the state of *Nibbāna* as "the bottomless gulf of a total annihilation."[122] However, according to Jayasuriya, is a reality that has an absolutely independent existence, in that its characteristics do not depend on anything outside of itself. It is a state of being, because it exists, performing function of its own. It is radically different from the state of the mundane elements.[123] Humphreys states that *Nibbāna* is the cessation of becoming, a stopping of the wheel of rebirth, because the motive power of its revolution, the desire for life, has stopped.[124] According to Buddhist humanism, *Nibbāna* is the highest state of happiness it is emancipates from burden and bondage. It is free from the

slavery of passions, the blindness of self-deception and deceptive happiness of the senses. However, it is difficult to recognize the state of *Nibbāna* and the way for understanding as in *Saṁyutta Nikāya* mentions that man "belonging to this life, that are undecaying, not subject to time, inviting to come and see, leading onward (to *Nibbāna*), to be realized each for himself by the wise."[125]

It can attain with an individual who sees deeply and thoroughly the truth of suffering, its root-causes. And he strives with a mind unswerving in the final cessation of suffering.

"The Holy Ones know it as bliss: the personality's cessation;
Repugnant to the Worldly folk,
but not to those who clearly see
What others count as highest bliss,
the Holy Ones regard as only pain;
What those regard as only pain is for the
Holy Ones sheer bliss."[126]

In Buddhist humanism, *Nibbāna* is recognized as twofold in one way, namely, *Nibbāna* with the remaining life (*sa-upādisesa*) and *Nibbāna* without the remaining life (*anupādisesa*). That is why that in *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha said, "One who is ablaze with lust depraved with malicebewildered with delusion if lust be abandoned no longer plans thus, no longer suffers thus. To that extent, *Nibbāna* is seen in this life it is to be realized for themselves by the wise."[127] The *Dhammapada* cites, "These wise ones, meditative, persevering, always putting forth strenuous effort, attain to *Nibbāna*, the highest freedom and happiness" (*Te jhāyino sātatikā niccaṃ dalhaparakkamā, phusanti dhirā Nibbānam yogakkhemam anuttaram*).[128] *Nibbāna* without the remaining life (*anupādisesa*) is cited in the Path of Purification (translation by ǎṇamoli) that "being wearied by the

occurrence and dissolution of formations, they attain it thinking 'Let us dwell in bliss by being without consciousness here and now and reaching the cessation that is *Nibbāna*."[129]

Although many scholars distinguish two angles of negative and positive, *Nibbāna* is described as the path cessation of becoming (*bhavanirodha*), of craving (*taṇhakkhaya*) and of suffering (*dukkhakkhaya, avyāpajjha*). One of the most important positions of this path is that it extinguishes of the fires of lust (*lobha*), hatred (*dosa*) and delusion (*moha*), free man from worldly ties (*mokkha, vimutti*), and state highest happiness (*parama-sukha*) for the life's goal of Buddhist humanism.

The Noble Eightfold Path

The Eightfold Pathis to be followed for the elimination of suffering. It is called Path Middle (*majjhima patipada*), because it lies between the two extreme paths of self-indulgence (*kamasukhallikanu-yoga*) and self-mortification (*attakilamathanu-yoga*), which had been discovered through personal experience of the Buddha prior to His Enlightenment. This Path is the prescription for the sufferings of existence. It is craving which binds one to cyclic existence and ever present in life is to be destroyed. It ensures ethical and moral behavior of the practitioner and leads him to liberation from suffering. It enhances the culture and development of one's three avenues of action: body, speech and mind for the betterment of oneself and other beings; ultimately, leading one to perfection.

The **Noble Eightfold Path** (*ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo*) consists of eight factors, namely, right understanding (*sammādiṭṭhi*), right thought (*sammāsamkappa*), right speech (*sammāvācā*), right action (*sammākammanta*), right livelihood (*sammājiva*), right effort (*sammāvāyāma*), right mindfulness

(*sammāsati*), right concentration (*sammāsamādhi*). The factors of the Path are inter-related and to be practiced simultaneously. They are mutually inclusive and mutually supportive. In these eight factors we also find the aim at promoting and perfecting the three essentials of Buddhist humanism's training and discipline consisting of morality (*sīla*), concentration (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*paññña*).[130]

Both of right understanding (*sammāditthi*), right thought (*sammā-samkappa*) is considered in initial stage as faith (*saddhā*), which ultimately becomes wisdom (*paññña*). (1) **Right understanding**, viz. understanding the world and human existence in terms of the four Noble Truths, (2) **Right thought**, viz., to avoid all thoughts of selfish desire, ill-will, hatred (*avyapada*) and violence (*avihiṁsa*) as the result free from lust and craving which hanker after pleasures of the senses.

Morality (*sīla*) based on love and compassion, are included of three factors (3) **Right speech** (*sammāvācā*), viz., the correct speech deals with four kinds of abstaining from telling lies, from tale bearing or back-biting (*pisunavaca*), from using harsh, rude, impolite, malicious and abusive language, and from irresponsible, vain talk such as foolish babble, gossip. (4) **Right action** (*sammākammanta*), viz., abstinence of bodily misconduct taking life, stealing and sexual misconduct. It guarantees the right to live, right to possess and right to maintain sexual relations of man within the confines of legally permitted boundary. (5) **Right livelihood** (*sammājiva*), viz., rejecting wrong kinds of living, which bring about harm to sentient beings such as trading in arms (*satthavanijja*) or lethal weapons, in human beings (*sattavanijja*), in flesh (*mamsavanijja*), in intoxicating drinks (*majjavanijja*) or drugs, in poisons (*visavanijja*).

Concentration (*samādhi*) is the gate of mind that leads to intuitive knowledge and thereby to the annihilation of craving for the world. It is also called mental discipline or

psychological development referred to states of mental absorption in which is the aggregate of (6) **Right effort**, viz., putting forth effort consciously in four ways: to prevent the arising of unwholesome thoughts that have not yet arisen; to abandon unwholesome thoughts that have already arisen, to develop wholesome thoughts that have not yet arisen, and to maintain wholesome thoughts that have already arisen by one who practices the path of emancipation. (7) **Right mindfulness** is contemplation of the body (*kayanupassana*), of sensation (*vedananupassana*), of mind (*cittanupassana*) and of mind-objects (*dhammanupassana*). It is mentioned clearly to the awareness (*sati*) and observation (*anupassā*) of in-and-out breathing (*ānāpānasati*). This way of meditation in *Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* has been spoken in reference to this: "There is this one way, for the purification of beings, for the overcoming of sorrows and griefs, for the going down of suffering and miseries, for winning the right path, for realizing *Nibbāna*, that is to say, the four applications of mindfulness."[131] (8) **Right concentration**, viz., replying on the basic of four stages of meditative absorptions (*jhāna*) that five hindrances (*nivaraṇa*) of lustful desire (*kāmacchanda*), ill-will or hatred (*vyāpāda*), torpor and languor (*thina-middha*), restlessness and worry (*uddhacca-kukkucca*) and skeptical doubt (*vicikicchā*) are destroyed. Further there are four other higher or subtler planes of mental abstraction known as *Āyatanas* (*ākāsānañcāyatana*). The term keynotes used to refer to this concentrated nature of mind are *ekaggatā* (*citta ekaggatā*: one-pointedness of mind) and *ekodibhāva* (*cetaso ekodiblıāva*: unified state of mind) as the path of spiritual development.

The relation between concentration and wisdom is closed. Perfect wisdom arises through perfect concentration and perfect release is the product of perfect wisdom (*sammāsamādhissa sammāñāṇam pahoti sammāñāṇassā sammāvimutti pahoti*).[132] Likewise, it is stated elsewhere that he whose mind is concentrated sees and hears things as they

really are (*samāhito bhikkhave bhikkhu yathābhūtaṃ pajānāti*).[133] In other words, with perfect wisdom the three forms of higher knowledge or *tisso vijjā* which successively pertain to a being's continuance in *saṃsāra* or transmigration (*pubbe nivāsānussati ñāna*), the efficacy of *kamma* or action (*sattānaṃ cutūpapātañaṇa*), and the elimination of all *saṃsāric* bonds, i.e., *āsavas* (*āsavānam khayañāṇa*) and ultimately lead to the attainment of *Nibbāna* are acquired as a result of this concentration of the mind.

From this brief account of the path, it is say that the Eightfold path in Buddhist humanism opens the door of wisdom leading human being to the realization of ultimate reality, to complete freedom, happiness of *Nibbāna*. It is free from defilements (*parisuddhe pariyodāte anaṅganevigatū-pakkilese*), pliable and malleable (*mudubhūte kammaniye*) and imperturbable by disturbing external stimuli (*ānejjappatte*).[134]

Sublime State of Mind (*Brahmavihāra*)

Brahmavihāra (sublime state of mind) also called *appamaññā* (freedom of mind), which is a name for the four practices of mental development, loving kindness (*mettā*), compassion (*karuṇā*), sympathetic joy (*muditā*), and equanimity (*upekkhā*). The classical formula given in the *Pāli Nikāya* in explanation of four divine states run as follows: "Herein a monk lets his mind pervade one quarter of the world with thoughts of loving kindness, compassion, sympathetic joy and equanimity and so the second, the third and the fourth quarter; and thus the whole world, above, below, around and every where does he continue to pervade with heart free from anger and ill-will"[135]

The *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* analyses the mental and physical phenomena (*dhamma*) on the basis of skilled states (*kusalā-dhamma*), unskilled states (*akusalā-dhamma*) and the states that are neither skilled nor unskilled (*avyākatā-dhamma*). The

divine states connected with a section on the mental absorption (*jhāna*) under the states that are skilled. In order to attain the sphere of form (*rūpūpapattiyā*) one cultivates the way thereto and enters and abides in the four mental absorption successively. The first three absorptions are accompanied only by the first three divine states; only in the fourth mental absorption are found all the four divine states, because poise comes only in the fourth absorption.[136]

The four practices of mental development in Buddhist humanism's thought or four practices meditations on *brahmavihāra* are expounded as the way high development of knowledge. On the practice of meditation *mettā* (loving-kindness) one should develop loving-kindness towards all beings as his object. One contemplates with *'ahaṃ avero homi'* (may I be free from enmity); *'abbyāpajjho homi'* (may I be free from ill-will); *'anīgho homi'* may I be free from distress); *'sukhī attānaṃ pariharāmi'* (may I keep myself happy) as the *Paṭisambhidā* said, "May all beings be free from enmity, affliction and anxiety and live happily. May all breathing things; all who are born; all individuals of whatever kind be free from enmity, affliction and anxiety, may they live happily."[137] It has the characteristic of being a procedure of modes of beneficence that is mental freedom from the root of hatred. The practice of meditation on *karuṇā* (compassion) one who should be developed the heart of quiver at the pain of others. His mind always suffuses compassion for miserable, wicked living creatures and associates with delighting in and enjoying doing harm to none. It has the characteristic of evolving the mode of removing one own pain and others suffer that is mental freedom from cruelty. The practice of meditation on *muditā* (sympathetic joy) one dwells with mind accompanied by sympathetic joy for a lovely, pleasant person. It has the characteristic of gladness that is way of mental freedom from the absence of envying and jealousy, from the destruction of disaffection by seeing

the prosperous state of other beings. The practice of meditation on *upekkhā* (equanimity) one who should dwells with mind accompanied by equanimity for a person who is neither pleasant nor unpleasant. One contemplates with 'May I be without enmity'. He suffuses all beings with equanimity that is mental freedom from distraction. In the *Vatthūpama Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, the Buddha said, "He dwells, having suffused the first quarter with a mind of loving-kindness, likewise the second, likewise the third, likewise the fourth; just so above, below, across; he dwells having suffused the whole world everywhere, in every way, with a mind of loving-kindness that is far-reaching, widespread, immeasurable, without enmity, without malevolence. He dwells, having suffused the first quarter with a mind of compassion sympathetic joy equanimity that is far-reaching, widespread, and immeasurable, without enmity, without malevolence. He comprehends: 'There is this (*arahant*-ship), there is a low (anguish and its uprising), there is the excellent, and there is a further escape from perceptions.' For one thus knowing, thus seeing, the mind is freed from the canker of sense-pleasures and the mind is freed from the canker of becoming and the mind is freed from the canker of ignorance. In freedom the knowledge comes to be that he is freed, and he comprehends: 'Destroyed is birth, brought to a close is the Brahma-faring, done is what was to be done, there is no more of being such or such.' This is called who is washed with an inner washing."[138]

These four divine states have the bliss of insight and the attainment of a happy existence as their common result. Their several results are the destruction of aversion, of cruelty, of dislike and lust. These four *brahmavihāras* also called *appamāṇā* are, sometimes, connected with *cetovimutti* (emancipation of mind), to read *appamāṇācetovimutti* (emancipation of mind through infinitudes). Each of the four *brahmavihāras* or *appamāṇās* is severally connected with

cetovimutti (emancipation of mind) and is termed *mettā-cetovimutti* (freedom of mind through loving-kindness), etc.[139]

Regarding to the wanderer's query about the practice of the *brahmavihāras* (sublime state of mind) without mentioned to connection of *cetovimutti* (freedom of mind). The Buddha, in telling his disciples what to really to the wanderer's query as to whether he (the Buddha) teaches *Brahmavihāras* (sublime state of mind) the in the same way as they (the wanderers) do, or in a different way, begins by saying to them: 'You should ask them, how is freedom of mind through loving kindness compassion, sympathetic joy, equanimity made to become? What does it lead to? What is its excellence? What its fruits? What its goal?' The word *cetovimutti* (emancipation of mind) connected closely to each of the four *Brahmavihāras*, while it is conspicuously absent from the wanderers talk.[140] It is said the difference between the *brahmavihāras* (sublime state of mind) in practice. The practice of the *Brahmavihāras* (sublime state of mind) by the non-Buddhists is results in rebirth in the *Brahma*-world or in union with *Brahmā* (*bṛahmā-sahavyatā*), whereas in Buddhist humanism, the person attains emancipation of mind (*cetovimitti*) through the practice of *Brahmavihāras* becomes a Non-returner (*anāgāmin*) the third stage on the way to *Arahantship*.[141]

Emancipation of mind through the practice of loving-kindness has beauty (*subha*), as its highest limit; emancipation of mind through compassion has infinity of space (*ākāsānañ-cāyatana*) as its highest; emancipation of mind through sympathetic joy has infinity of consciousness (*viññāṇañ-cāyatana*) as its highest; emancipation of mind through equanimity has as its highest the sphere of nothingness (*akiñcaññāyatana*).[142]

The *Brahmavihāra* inspires man to treat the path of

enlightened humanism. It motivates man to make the world a kingdom of enlightenment. That is the path of the knowledge of life and the liberation of mind from all ills. It applied and verified by self-realization move man to wards the perfect perception on impermanence (*anicca*) of one's body and mental functions; on subject of conflict (*dukkha*) contemplates the kind of ill of body or mental pain.

It says that, the perspective of existence in Buddhist humanism is based on Conditioned *Dhammas* (*sankhāra dhammas*) and Unconditioned *Dhammas* (*asankhāra dhammas*) or *Nibbāna*. Conditioned *Dhammas* is everything, which arises because of conditions and depends on the concept of 'flux.' The world and human beings or consciousness (*citta*), factory of consciousness (*cetasika*) and form (*rūpa*) is influenced by the characteristics of impermanence (*anicca*), unsatisfactoriness (*dukkha*) and egolessness (*anattā*). Unconditioned *Dhammas* has to fall away again when the conditions have ceased that leading to the state of highest happiness (*parama-sukha*).

Through the Four of Noble Truths, Noble Eightfold Path, as well the practice of Sublime state of mind, man is directed towards the cessation of craving, the ending ignorance that is beyond the transitory, changing and perishing of human existence for enlightenment. In other words, Buddhist humanism motivates man to the world a kingdom of enlightenment. That is the path of the knowledge of life and the liberation of mind from all ills. It applied and verified by self-realization move man to wards the perfect perception on impermanence (*anicca*) of one's body and mental functions; on subject of conflict (*dukkha*) contemplates the kind of ill of body or mental pain. The Buddhist humanism sets man's fact as essential existence. It emancipated man from all sorrow and suffering by emphasizing the need of the destruction of all egoism, the

abandonment of selfish cravings, and the expulsion of all eagerness of sensuous desire. It leads man to the way of state of *Nibbāna*. It is really a life of perpetual fellowship in the atmosphere of truth, goodness, freedom, equality and enlightenment.

References

1. S. III, pp. 12, 18, 66, 90.
2. A. II, p. 176.
3. S. III, p. 20.
4. Ps. Ānāpānakathā, I, p. 230.
5. S. IV, p. 28.
6. M. I, p. 230.
7. M. I, p. 380.
8. Ps. I, p. 37.
9. Vism. p. 6.
10. Cp. MA. II, p. 113.
11. M. p. 28; S. II, p. 20.
12. S. II, p. 191; A. IV, p. 100 ff.
13. A. IV, p. 136 f.
14. S. II, p. 94-95.
15. D. II, p. 144.
16. S. IV, p. 53.
17. Ibid.
18. S. III, pp. 138-139.
19. Vism. p. 3.
20. VismA. p. 824.
21. S. III, p. 143.
22. A. I, p. 152.
23. D. III, p. 237; S. III, p. 144.
24. Vism. p. 75.
25. Vism. p. 66.
26. Vism. pp. 65, 77.
27. Cp, S. IV, p. 197.
28. Vism. p. 63.
29. A. IV, p. 37.
30. Nd. II, p. 42.
31. S. III, p. 142.

32. Dhp. v. 46.
33. Sn. v. 807.
34. Dhp. v. 40.
35. S. III, p. 141.
36. Vism. p. 31.
37. M. I, pp. 262-264; S. II, p. 27.
38. S. IV, pp. 69-70.
39. M. III, p. 64.
40. A. IV, p. 100.
41. D. II, p. 157.
42. S. II, p. 15 f.
43. Cp. S. IV, p. 259.
44. Dhp. v. 277.
45. S. IV, p. 28.
46. Dhp. v. 279
47. *Paṭisanbhidāmagga* I. 37
48. Dhp. v. 33.
49. Dhp. v. 34.
50. Dhp. v. 35.
51. Dhp. v. 36.
52. Dhp. v. 37.
53. A. I, p. 10.
54. S. II, p. 95.
55. David Hume, *'A treatise of Human Nature'*, Book I, Part IV, Sec. 6
56. *Yañ ca kho etaṃ bhikhave vuccati cittam iti pi mano iti pi viññāṇam iti pi*, S. II, p. 94; *Evaṃ pi te mano, ittham pi te mano, iti pi te cittaṃ*, D. III, p. 103.
57. S. III, p. 87.
58. *Cakkhuviññanamā, sotaviññanam ghānaviññānam, jivhāviññānam, kāyaviññānam, manodhātu, manoviññandhātu ime dhamma citta* Dhs., p. 264
59. *Arammanam cintetiti cittam*, Asl., p. 53.
60. A.II, p. 178; cp *Cittena niyyati loko cittena parikassati, cittassa ekadhammassa sabbeva vasam anvagū*: S. I, p. 39
61. M. I, p. 191.
62. M. I, pp. 256-257.
63. Abhs. Chapter I, part 3.
64. Kvu. II, p.338.
65. Abhs. II, p.2.

66. Dhs. pp. 246-266.
67. M. I. 257 f.
68. M. I. 257.
69. M. III, p. 25; MLS. III, p. 78.
70. S. I, p. 134; Therī. pp. 43, 472.
71. D. II, p. 302 sq.; III, pp. 102, 243; A. III, p. 400; Sn. v. 373; Iti. pp.181, 225, 230.
72. D. I, p. 215; II, p. 294; III, p. 228; S. I, p. 15; II, pp. 169 sq., 224; IV, pp. 175, 195; A. II, 165; III, p. 243.
73. DhsA. p. 119.
74. D. II, p. 73; A.I, p. 244; Thera. p. 188.
75. D. I, pp. 73, 246; II, pp. 83, 300; III, pp. 49 sq., 101, 234, 279; S. II, p. 23; III, p. 149., 224; M.I, pp. 60, 144, 276; III, pp. 4, 295.
76. S. I, p. 23; V, pp. 241, 251; A.I, p. 264; III. 443; IV, p. 7 sq.; M.I, p. 483.
77. Nd. II, p. 487; Ps. I, p. 130.
78. D. II, p. 91;Sn. vv. 14, 916, 968.
79. Dhs. pp.167-173; D. I, p. 34 sq; M.I, pp. 276 sq., 350 sq., 454 sq.; A.I, p. 53, 193.
80. D. II, pp. 216, 353; M. III, p. 71.
81. D. II, pp. 196, 211, 227; III, p. 220.
82. Nd. II, p. 550
83. The *Abhidharmakośa* of Vasubandhu (See Abhk. II, vv. 23-34; together with comment in *Sphuṭārthābhidharmakosavyākhyā*, II, pp. 41-60; also *Abhidharmadīpa*, II, vv. 112-125) number of *caitasikas* is fixed at forty-six. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* gives an enumeration of fifty-four *caitasikas*.
84. 'The Questions of King Milinda', tr. by T.W. Rhys Davids, Book III, chapter 7, Oxford (1963), p. 87.
85. *Rūppatiti rūpam situnhādivirodhipaccayehi vikaramapajjati apadiyatiti vā attha.* Vibht., p.7; cp *Rūppatiti rūpam situnhādivirodhipaccayehi visamapattiti vasena vikāram apajjati, tehi vā vikāram apadiyatiti atthe.* Paramatthadipam, p. 18
86. Vism. p. 964.
87. P.E.D, ed. by T.W.Rhys Davids & William Stede, s.v. *ruppana.*
88. S. V, p. 3.
89. Cp. Vism. p. 965.
90. A. III, p. 416.
91. S. IV, p. 259.
92. Vism. p. 499.

93. *Pañcavaggiyā bhikkhu:* The first five disciples of the Buddha are, namely, Kondañña, Vappa, Bhaddiya, Mahānāma and Assajī. They also happened to be his erstwhile colleagues.
94. S. V, p. 421;
95. The *Vinaya Pitaka* (*Vin.* I, p. 10) version drops nos. 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 which does not, hover, materially alter the content of *dukkha*, The *Vibhanga* contains a similar list with the exception of *vyādhi*. M. I, p. 185 and D. II, p. 305 sq. drops nos. 3, 7, 10, 11; adds despair.
96. Vism. p. 499.
97. See D. II, p. 306; M. I, p. 10, 85-87; S. III, p. 1.
98. S. I, p. 40.
99. D. II, p. 308; S. IV, p. 421.
100. S. IV, p. 382.
101. M. I, pp. 111-112.
102. S. III, p. 46.
103. S. III, p. 132.
104. S. III, p. 24; KS. III, p. 23.
105. S. I, p. 134 f.
106. Miln. p. 25 ff.
107. Dhp. v. 279.
108. S. II, p. 37.
109. Mrs. Rhys Davids, '*Buddhist Psychology*', 2nd ed., p. 244 f.
110. S. II, pp. 2, 103; M. III, pp. 63-64.
111. M. I, pp. 190-191.
112. S. V, p. 421.
113. D. II, p. 311.
114. S. I, p. 136.
115. S. IV, p. 359.
116. A. II, p. 34.
117. Ud. p. 129.
118. Ud. p. 128.
119. S. IV, pp. 251, 261.
120. Poussin, '*Way to Nirvāṇa*', p. 150.
121. Maxmuller, '*Studies in Buddhism*', p. 57.
122. Ibid. p. 51.
123. Jayasuriya, W.F., '*The Psychology and Philosophy of Buddhism*', Colombo (1963), p. 95.
124. Humphreys, Christmas, '*Buddhism*', London: The Buddhist Society (1956), p. 128.

125. S. IV, p. 339.
126. Sn. vv. 761-762.
127. A. I, p. 158.
128. Dhp. v. 23.
129. Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu (tr.), *'The Path of Purification'*, Colombo: R. Semage (1956), Chapter XXIII, part 30.
130. M. I, p. 301.
131. M. I, p. 63.
132. D. II, p. 217.
133. S. III, p. 13 f.
134. D. I, p. 76.
135. D. I, p. 250 f; III, p. 223 f; M. I, pp. 38, 297; II, pp. 76,195, 207; III, p. 146; S. IV, p. 296; A. V, pp. 299, 344.
136. Dhs., pp. 53-55.
137. Ps. II, p. 130.
138. M. I, pp. 38-39.
139. D. III, p. 248; M. I, pp. 297-298; M. III, p. 146; S. IV, p. 296.
140. S. V, p. 115 ff.
141. A. V, p. 300.
142. S. V, p.115 ff.

4

The Social Structure

THE QUALITY

Castes in society

It is difficult to find the general definition of the term 'caste' by the various thoughts of scholars. So Vidya Bhushan and D.R. Sachdeva suggest, "The best way to understand the term 'caste' is to examine the various factors underlying the caste system."[1] Caste system is established for first time after invading *Aryans* entered North India's territory. By the distinction is racism and skin's color, which *Ṛgvedic* society is divided into the well-known four castes (i.e. *Brāhmaṇa, Khattiya, Vessa* and *Sudda*). It says *Brāhmaṇa* (priest) was born from mouth of *Brahmā, Khattiya* (landed gentry) from his arms, *Vessa* (merchant) from his thighs and *Sudda* (manual worker) from his feet.[2]

In the *Pāli* term *'vaṇṇa-pokkharatā'* or *'vaṇṇa'* (*Vedic: varṇa*) is used as distinguishing mark of race or species, thus also constituting a mark of class (caste) distinction and translatable as "grade (social), rank, caste."[3] By the time the Buddha appeared, the place of Indian caste system in society had become character of sacred scriptures, hereditary and untouchable. The *Brāhmaṇa*, as the highest caste, claimed as the supreme domination of privileges in society. Meanwhile *Sudda* (manual worker), being considered as the lowest social group, were denied all opportunity of polity,

economy, society, education, religious freedom, justice and equality, and etc.

The social structure of Buddhist humanism rejects the any distinct view based on caste. Man possesses a free will and effort in the field of threefold action: in thought, in speech and in deed. The glory of human life, individual as well as social, lies in this element, but it is also the source of difficulties and sometimes of degradation of mankind.[4] Everyone, expressing himself through body-with-mind, is a chooser; he has the choice between free of will and restraint of will by regulation. He wants what he believes to be better and it is of his nature to seek freely, through many 'betters,' a 'best.'[5] It is completely different with the caste's view in the relation master-slaver of the Occident, or *Brāhmaṇa* (priest), *Khattiya* (landed gentry), *Vessa* (merchant), *Sudda* (manual worker) of India.

The Buddha was a human being alive to this world as one of the first humanistic leaders of mankind. He looked upon man's wayfaring in the world as a very true thing; he convinced that man's position is supreme, is his own master and there is no other being or power higher than himself judging over his destiny; his success or failure lies in his own will, choice and strength.

"The whole wide world we traverse with our thought,
And nothing finds to man more dearly than soul.
Since aye so dear the soul to others is,
Let the soul-lover harm no other man."[6]

Therefore, the Buddha rejected what is called caste system in sacred scriptures, hereditary and the inherent superiority. In *Aïguttara Nikāya*, He points out in the six breeds that the pure and value of man depended on welfare in the right way in deed, word and thought-on the breaking up of the body after death man arises in the good way, the

heaven-world or more from those if he rids himself of the five hindrances, weakens the mental defilements by insight become firmly in the four arising of mindfulness, makes become the seven factors of awakening, as they can become and breeds *Nibbāna,* which it do not depended on low-caste clan or high-caste clan, poor or rich, ill-wealth or wealth ...[7]

It clearly pointed out that the position of man depended on his conduct and behavior's attitudes as in the *Vasala Sutta* of *Sutta-Nipāta* say, "No birth makes an outcaste, and no birth makes one noble. It is conduct that makes one outcaste; it is conduct that makes one noble."[8] The Blessed One demonstrated to them the futility of caste distinctions by the following simple reasoning: Between ashes and gold there is a marked difference, but between *Brāhmaṇa* and *Chandāla* there is nothing of the kind. A *Brāhmaṇa* is not produced like fire by the friction of dry wood; he does not descend from the sky, or from the wind, nor does he arise piercing the earth. The *Brāhmaṇa* is brought forth from the womb of a woman in exactly the same way as a *Chandāla* (among low caste of *Suidda*). All human being have organs exactly alike; there is not the slightest difference in any respect.

It is not easy to put across this simple teaching of social philosophy to the haughty *Brāhmans;* despite the teaching of Buddha is dissemination widely in Indian society. The Buddha seems to have met very strong opposition from the well-known *Brāhmans* of his day. It is identified in many *Sutta,* where adduced different arguments in the view of caste system. Such as in the *Ambaṭṭha Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha explains to Ambaṭṭha that his lineage was traceable to the son of a slave girl of *Sākyas*. He also points out that if lineage is taken in consideration the *Khattiya* are the best, but he who is endowed with knowledge and conduct (*vijjā* and *caraṇa*) is the best among both men and gods, thereby implying that the righteous life leading to *Nibbāna* is independent of caste distinctions.[9] In the *Assalāyana Sutta* of

Majjhima Nikāya the Buddha asks Assalāyana as *brahmin* women are know to have periods, conceive, give birth and breast feed their infants and are seen as such by everybody, *brahmins* are being born like everybody else, why can they claim that they are the only legitimate sons of *Brahmā*, born from his mouth, and heirs of *Brahmā*?[10] In the *Vāseṭṭha Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha convinces the *brahmin* youth Vāseṭṭha that among grass, trees, worms, moths, fishes, beasts, birds, etc. there are various types whereas in the case of men they constitute only one. The differences among men are only nominal (*samaññā*) which are designated by depended on their occupations.[11] Sociologists and ethnologists regarding with men as color of skin, hair, form shape of skull, etc. are not absolute, and the human species remains one, despite those differences. The Buddha goes on to explain how a man becomes truly superior in the world as a genuine *Brāhman* by true knowledge and conduct which superiority cannot be overthrown by any secular power. In the *Kaṇṇakatthala Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha pointes out that the fire produced by dry teak or sal or *salala* or sandalwood has no difference in heat or brilliance whatsoever. Similarly, there is no difference in the quality of striving and the proper effort of the so-called four castes. Any division whether they are social, economic, intellectual or racial, is an obstacle for the realization of the spiritual unity of mankind.[12] In the *Esukārī Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, the Buddha argues that the divisions imposed on society by the *Brāhmans* are quite arbitrary and are not conducive to the good of the individual or of society. Giving its own alternative, the Buddha says that all the four castes alike can practice the pure life following the *Dhamma*, which is the true wealth of spiritual as well as material.[13]

From this point of view there is no reason whatever for one class of people to be hereditary rulers and masters over another class regarded as slaves and inferiors by birth. In

Buddhist humanism it is that all men are quality, nobody was born to become the master or the slave; everyone has the ability to rise to the highest position in society if he has the will and the ability to do so.

The Buddha tried to influence public opinion, he went from house to house without any regard for caste in his begging rounds and left the door of the *sāsana* (the teaching of Buddha) open for all four castes, saying that just as the waters of rivers from various directions flow down to the ocean and are known by the name 'sea water' those who entered the *sāsana* from whatever caste would be known as 'recluses, the sons of the *Sakya*' (*samana sakyaputtiya*). Indeed, the Buddha's *Saṅgha* consists of the young *brāhmaṇa* like Sāriputta, Moggalāna, and Kaccāna; of *Khattiya* like Ānanda, Rāhula and Anuruddha; of *Vessa* like Yasa who were 'men of the most respectable classes of society with an education in keeping with their social status'[14] ; and *Sudda* like Upāli, expert on the *Vinaya* (discipline) who had been a barber, Sāti who was a fisherman, Puṇṇa and Puṇṇikā who had been slave girls, Subhā who was the daughter of a smith,[15] and Chāpā, the daughter of a hunter. All of them are well integrated with the Buddha's purificatory teaching. The Buddha says, "In as much as the waters of various rivers, such as *Ganga, Yamuna, Aciravatī*, once they enter the sea will be called sea-water, even so, all people, from whatever family they come, would be known as the recluses (of the fraternity) of the son of *Sākyan*."[16]

Hence in Buddhist Order of monks the question of superiority or inferiority does not arise with reference to them. There are no inborn characteristics, which justify the caste distinctions. They are the result of conventions established by the people. So humanity being one, caste distinctions does not stand.

The subject of caste system or social inequality is outside

the *Saṅgha*. It is step by step to expel the thoughts of caste, which it adheres to sacred scriptures of *Vedas*. However, R. Flick state that the development of caste was in no way broken or even retarded by Buddhism. He adds that the Buddha's doctrine did not aim at a transformation of social conditions and it was taken for granted that they were unchangeable.[17] Charles Eliot argues that although the Buddha denied the superiority of the *Brāhmaṇa* he did not preach against caste, partly because it existed only in rudimentary form at the time.[18] Bougle states, "Certainly Buddhism, more than any other sect, must have appeared formidable to the *brāhmaṇas*: it tended to make them superfluous by limiting the place of rituals. It is clear that the Buddhist community worked to undermine the *brāhmaṇa's* clientele and the conflict of interests is undeniable."[19] Besides, Bougle acknowledge that Buddhists were far form 'reconstructing the edifice of Hindu society according to new plans: if they worked at replacing the roof, they never gave a thought to changing the foundations.'[20] Senart also writes that the conflict between the Buddhist and *Brāhmaṇas* was primarily a struggle for influence and that there was nothing in the Buddhist stand which aimed at changing the entire caste system.[21] Weber's study pointed out that the membership of the *Saṅgha* was predominantly recruited from the great noble families, the rich 'burghers', and the *Brāhmaṇas* who were distinguished representatives of a 'cultured laity.' According to him, Buddhism had no tie with any social movement and it ignored caste or the 'status order'. In his view, early Buddhism as whole was the product not of the underprivileged but of very clearly privileged strata.[22] Chattopadhyaya also argues that the Buddha only created an illusion of liberty, equality, and fraternity by modeling his *Saṅgha* on the tribal values, whereas in reality these values were being trampled upon in the world outside the *Saṅgha*.[23] These points of view are not based on a

systematic analysis of the relevant Buddhist sources. It is important to first try and understand the Buddhist system of stratification and then relate them to actual developments in Buddhist humanism.

The objection caste system, which *Vedas* Scriptures imposed, a regime to have domination over man, Buddhism humanism carried out the first reform in caste system. The new philosophy, new social world is division of the triumvirate *Khattiyas, Brāhmaṇas* and *Gahapatis* (householder or member of the gentry) with functions in fields of power, religion and economy. Soon after the Buddha made his converts, Bimbisara, the king of *Magadha* along with twelve myriad *Brāhmaṇas* and *Gahapatis* (member of the gentry) have a lot of sympathy for support from his view.[24] The new social organization including *Khattiyas, Brāhmaṇas* and *Gahapatis* is no distinction superiority or inferiority; it is reciprocal action for well being of man. In *Dīgha Nikāya, Gahapatis* (member of the gentry) is considered as the treasures of the *cakkavatti* or the ideal ruler of the world; when the righteous ruler makes an appearance on the earth he is accompanied by seven treasures: the wheel, an elephant, horse, gem, women, *Gahapati* (householder), and councilor.[25]

The new division of society is not a replica of the Brahmanical system of differentiation. The Buddhist humanism invariably places *Khattiyas* first in the serial order of social groups with *Brāhmaṇas* following next. The Buddha says that it is *Khattiyas* here who first marked out from the mass of the people and represented as essential to the social order, not *Brāhmaṇas*.[26] In fact, the *Brāhmaṇas* appears very similar to the *Bhikkhu* who lives on the periphery of society, collecting alms from villages and towns and returning to the forest to meditate. There is no evidence that the *Brāhmaṇas* (priest) plays any role in society. In the *Aggaññña Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, it expounds clearly how the caste system appeared

on the earth which beginning with the formation of *Khattiyas* (who the majority recognizes him as a chief) and then in turn *Jayaka* (meditator), *Ajjayaka* (who are reluctant to continue to practise meditation but they settle around towns and villages, and write verses and prose), *Vessa* (who are married and gain their livelihood by various kinds of work such as farming and trading), *Sudda* (who are poor, of low intelligence and coarse, and live by hunting and fishing, etc.) and give prominence to the role of *Khattiyas*.[27]

"The Khattiyas is the best among this folk
Who put their trust in lineage.
But one in wisdom and in virtue clothed,
Is best of all 'mong spirits and men."[28]

It is said that king Pasenadi asks the Buddha whether there could be any distinction between the four castes (*vaṇṇas*) as mentioned in the *Kaṇṇakatthala Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*.[29] The Buddha answers saying that there is no distinction among people if they possess the proper qualities for striving and make the right effort, regardless of whether they are from *Khattiyas, Brāhmaṇas, Vessas* or *Suddas vaṇṇa*.[30] Similarly, in the *Madhurā Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* Ven. Kaccāna tells the king of *Madhurā* that a person from any of the four *vaṇṇas* (castes) are exactly the same; he does not see any difference between them in this respect.[31]

The wall of caste, in fact, is major obstacle to seek the solution harmony society as Vidya Bhushan and D.R. Sachdeva write that caste system has given rise to several evils; It has denied mobility of labor since the individual must follow the caste occupation and cannot change it according to his likes or dislikes; It lead to untouchability; it has retarded the growth of solidarity and brotherhood in the society, it often results in putting man on wrong occupation that he cannot take up any other profession even

though he may possess the skill and liking for that; It does not utilize fully the talents and capabilities of the population and is, therefore, a barriers to optimum productivity; It has proved an obstacle to the growth of national unity, the member belonging to a caste carry caste feelings and manifest blind and over-riding loyalty to their caste, but ignoring the healthy social standards of justice, fair play, equity and brotherhood, they do not hesitate in harming the interests of members of other castes; It denies equal rights to all irrespective of their caste, creed or color, social barriers are erected specially in the way of lower class individuals who are not given freedom for the mental and physical development and are not provided with opportunities.[32] Or "It is the spirit of caste-patriotism which engenders opposition to other castes and creates an unhealthy atmosphere for the growth of national consciousness."[33]

It is clear how is the importance to demolish the solid wall of caste system survived long time in *Vedas* Scriptures, in one's consciousness. Buddhist humanism went to the very root of the. matter and revealed the false character of its foundation to prove all people are equal without the distinction by birth, sex or social position and it is their conduct that makes them noble or ignoble.

Human rights

Human Rights are the most important subject for the interesting of in present-day world that it deals with man. In the seventeenth century philosophers and statesmen began to define these rights and enshrine them in constitutions such as the 'Fundamental Orders of Connecticut' as early as 1639.[34] In modern time the General Assembly of the United Nations stated publicly 'The Universal Declaration of Human Rights' on 10th December 1948. Thirty-article including in Universal Declaration of

Human Rights contributed remarkable in historical humankind; it opened up a new chapter really for man.

Here it also is considered what the relation between Buddhist humanism and this declaration are. In Perera's commentary, he observes that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to have the connection in harmony with early Buddhist teachings both in letter and in spirit. Ananda Guruge writes in the Perera's foreword of the commentary, "Professor Perera demonstrates that every single Article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – even the labor rights to fair wages, leisure and welfare – has been adumbrated, cogently upheld and meaningfully incorporated in an overall view of life and society by the Buddha."[35] Kenneth Inada suggests, "There is an intimate and vital relationship of the Buddhist Norm or *Dhamma* with that of human rights." He explains the relationship, "Human rights is indeed an important issue, but the Buddhist position is that it is ancillary to the larger or more basic issue of human nature. It can be asserted that the Buddhist sees the concept of human rights as a legal extension of human nature. It is crystallization, indeed formalization, of the mutual respect and concern of all persons, stemming from human nature. Thus, human nature is the ultimate source, the basis from which all other attributes or characteristics are to be delineated. They all have their respective *raison d'etre* in it. They are reflections and even byproducts of it. The reason for assigning human nature the basic position is very simple. It is to give human relations a firm grounding in the truly existential nature of things: that is, the concrete and dynamic relational nature of persons in contact with each other, that which (*sic*) avoids being caught up in rhetorical or legalistic tangles."[36]

Indeed, as a religion and philosophy, Buddhist humanism concerning for human rights finds expression

through the value system it upholds and considers salutary for mankind. There is no specific codification of human rights in a single place in the Buddha's discourses. However, his view of human rights can find existing in various *Suttas* that emerges from two parts basis of philosophical considerations and the ethic all assumptions. The philosophical consideration is that all human beings are born with complete freedom and responsibility. Not being the creations of a Creator, they are subject only to non-deterministic causal laws and their destinies are in their own hands. "One, indeed, is one's own master" (*attā hi attano nātho*), says the *Dhammapada*.[37] Human beings therefore are free to attain the highest value of materially and mentally. The ethical assumption is more relevant at the social level. It is the insight that man and all other living beings desire happiness: *sukhakāmāni bhūtāni*.[38] With these two basic assumptions Buddhism looks upon man as quite competent in the task of ensuring for himself and his fellow beings success and happiness in this world and in securing for himself his own ultimate emancipation from the turmoil of existence.

The activities of the Buddhist humanism are directed towards acceptance and practice of principles of human rights in a very practical way as the reaction against limitations imposed on human rights by the prevalent Brahmanical system. It demands that conditions in society should be conducive to the cultivation of the Buddhist social ethic as major role for effective implementation of human rights concepts.

The social ethic to be achieved mainly through the practice of Noble Eightfold Path, fundamental Buddhist concepts such as the *Pañcasīla* (the five Precepts) and "that admirable virtue denoted by the Buddhist concept of Benevolence as broadly implied in loving kindness (*mettā*), non-injury (*ahiṁsā*), as well as the more apparent social virtues such as liberality (*dāna*) which is the basis of altruism

for the Buddhist, gratitude (*kataññutā*), reverence (*gārava*), courtesy (*peyyavajja*), equanimity (*samānattatā*) humanity, toleration (*khanti-soracca*) and veracity or sincerity (*sacca*)."[39] The first four of Buddhist *Pañcasīla* (as mentioned at chapter five) could be looked upon as the earliest pronouncement on human rights in the history of mankind in that it embodies recognition of (a) the right of life, and (b) the right to property.

The conception of rights in Buddhist humanism is not only the limitation in humans, but extending to other living creatures too as it has been indicated at the very outset of the discourses in *Pāli Nikāya* that is concerned with 'all beings' (*sabbe sattā*). The recognition and observance of human rights in the Buddhist humanism have to be effected mainly through the fulfillment of one's duties and obligations towards society. The term 'rights' has vociferously surfaced in Western cultural contexts, meanwhile rights have been denied to man mostly in that part of the world. This was perhaps due to "an outlook nurtured on values which breed individualism and ethnocentrisms and which therefore considers the world as having been given to one group to be thoroughly exploited for its own again."[40]

Based on reason (*dhammādhipateyya* or *dhammavitakka*)[41] and conscience (*attādhipateyya*),[42] the 'human rights' of Buddhist humanism is indicated in the ability to judge the moral worth of one's own motives and actions, and opt for what is right and desirable both for one as well as for others. Together they partly constitute the 'faculty of mindfulness' (*satindriya*) in human beings. Reason and conscience is understood as the criteria for distinguishing between the 'good' (*kusala*) and the 'bad' (*akusala*) in the moral sense that indicates in *Kālāma Sutta*.[43] In the *Singālovāda Sutta*, it deals with bilateral social relationships between recognition and the observance of rights through the discharge of duties and obligations bring social and moral ethics of Buddhist humanism to the forefront.[44]

Buddhist humanism upholds the essential thought that every human being is born with complete freedom and responsibility. Human beings are not the product of a Creator. Their destiny lies in their own hands. This freedom of human being as commencing with their birth itself, and the recognition of their equality in the Buddha's emphasis on self-reliance, which he did by extolling what he called *attakāra* (personal endeavor), *purisakāra* (human effort), *purisathāma* (human strength), *purisaviriys* (human energy), *purisaparakkama* (human valor) and *purisadhorayha* (human responsibility) in the *Sampasādanīya Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*.[45] Just one is one's own master, one is certainly born free, and if all human beings could attain Buddhahood.

Buddhist humanism posits a basic equality between all human beings in respect of their essential nature. In other words, all persons are equal in dignity and rights. As Jayatillake writes, "the fundamental equality of all mankind as one community is recognized for the first time in human thought, in the sense that man's essential nature is the same whatever the individual differences due to heredity, environment or *karmic* factors may be."[46] However, it has to be realized the claim that all human beings are equal is more prescriptive that descriptive.

It referred to indifference between individuals (*puggalavemattatā*)[47] in their qualities and in their circumstances of life. According to the thought of Buddhist humanism, the main arguments of this basic equality, the most significance is biology and anthropology.[48] The biological argument points to the fact that *homosapiens* constitutes a single species in contradistinction to other species to which the difference kinds of fauna and flora belong. Though arrived from different investigations, the conclusion of the basic equality of all human beings is certainly in accord with the modern biological outlook. The *Vāseṭṭha Sutta* of *Sutta-Nipāta*[49] state that unlike in the case

of the plant and animal kingdom which are characterized by differences of species (*liṅgaṃ jātimayaṃ*), notwithstanding minor differences in the color of the hair or in the pigmentation of the skin and other similar visible aspects all men should be looked upon as belonging to one single species, sine in physical and other vital characteristics all human beings are the same. The *Aggañña Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* adduces 'the anthropological argument' that all human beings were "like unto themselves and not unlike" (*aññesam sadisānaññeva no asadisānam*)[50] and is said to be "in accordance with the Universal Norm and not contrary to it" (*dhammena'eva no dhamena*: loc. cit.) the equality implied is basic, fundamental and nature. It states further that social distinctions arose in settled society through a division of labor as a necessity for its very existence culminating in a contract of society and a contract of government,[51] based on democratic concepts, reflecting the sense of equality that would exist among human beings. However, absolute equality between man and man in respect of his essential nature should be recognized in human affairs whether conceived in terms of the life led here or hereafter (*diṭṭhe c'eva dhamme abhisamparāyañca*) for the Universal Norm is said to reign supreme in man's life: *Dhammo hi seṭṭho jane tasmiṃ* (loc. cit.).

It seems that Buddhist humanism recognizes the fundamental equality of all human beings belonging to the people's essential natures. They are the same whatever their individual differences, such as those due to heredity, environment and other factors. In the final analysis, face the same basic phenomena of birth, decay as spelling out the first Noble Truth and that these problems is overcame at the same time they are in a position by attaining the very highest moral and spiritual level through a development of the human potential. Human life is so placed in the cosmic scheme of things, that human being alone enjoys the best

opportunity of transcending the unsatisfactoriness of existence into *Nibbāna* – the highest happiness. It is clearly to recognize that human beings are equal in the same basic problems that faces as well as they are endowed with unique potentiality to attain the highest.

As a 'designer' in nature, man inclines toward his emancipation in the process of active phenomenon (*saṃkhāra*) and attaining the highest happiness of *Nibbāna*. It states how and on what grounds in the consideration equal of all human beings. It is truly to say that this equality imply in the meaning 'in accordance with universal norm' (vide infra) and 'not contrary to it' (*dhammer'eva no adhamena*).[52] Such a conception of equality requires that rights and freedoms should remain untrammeled by considerations such as race, color, sex, etc.

The process of human life operates through the doors of mind, body and speech. Every action or endeavor of man is mind origin and manifests it by body or speech. In his discourses like *Vasala Sutta*[53] and *Madhurā Sutta*,[54] the Buddha states one is inheritor to one's action (*kammadāyādo*) irrespective of such factors as race, color, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. These distinct factors are not countenanced in any way of Buddhist humanism. It is important to say that the way of Buddhist humanism has recognized one's rights and freedoms in both aspects of Material (*attha*) and Spiritual (*dhamma*) through appropriate action, i.e. through *sammākammanta* – the Buddhist social principles.

Buddhist humanism extends the rights of equality to all living beings by toleration and respect. It is perceived one to treat 'the other' comparing the other to oneself: *attānam upamam katvā*. [55] This principle is well brought out in the *Veludvāreyya Sutta* of *Saṁyutta Nikāya*[56] that concerning to the rights and security of the others in the ethical value as of

prime interest. In the *Kālāma Sutta* of *Aṅguttara Nikāya*[57] the human rights are saw clearly through the standpoint of Buddhist humanism where shows that no preference for any one form of polity over another.

Realistic evaluation of Buddhist humanism is the measures of human situation in terms of the Universal Norm (*dhamma*) or principle of righteousness without relying on any supreme power which is imposed by an fallibility human institutions as Jayatilleke writes, "ultimate sovereignty resided, not in any rule, human or divine, nor in anybody governing the state, nor in the state itself, but in *Dhamma*, The eternal principle righteousness."[58]

Buddhist humanism looks upon the human being as the sovereignty immanent in the *Dhamma* that the essence of human dignity in the assumption of man's responsibility for his own governance. In other words, every individual (*manussattam*) may find himself or herself placed and worth irrespective of the circumstances of life. Buddhist humanism recognizes the worth of the individual as a human being, as well affirms the individual's right before the law (*dhamma*) or the eternal (*sanantano*) self-operative Cosmic Principle of Righteousness. The law is said, "As an instrument for achieving certain ends, which are held to be socially desirable. What these ends are, or should be, is a matter for ethics." [59] The Buddhist humanist attitude towards the law stems from two conceptions:[60] (1) that of the 'Rule of Righteousness' embedded in the imagery of the *Dhammacakka* or the 'Wheel of Righteousness' and (2) that of the 'happiness and well-being of mankind' (*bahujanahita, bahujanasukha*).

Based on the concept of the 'Wheel of Righteousness' or Universal Law (*rājā cakkavatti*), a Righteous Law (*dhammiko dhammarājā*), if man rules with proper regard for the law (*dhammam garukaronto*), it gained benefic of providing care and protection righteously (*dhammikam rakkhāvaranaguttim*)

not only to human beings, irrespective of their level in society, but even to beasts and birds (*migapakkhisu*).[61] The concept of the 'common good' must necessarily involve the right of recognition of everyone everywhere. Because, whatever be the forms of distinctions is basically meaningless, underestimate human dignity. Furthermore, it can bring about serious consequences of harmful, repugnant and inimical attitude.

Perera observes that the worth of the individual taken in conjunction with the conception of the 'rule of Righteousness' and the idea of the 'common good of mankind' demands that the problems of weak, the down-trodden, the humble, the needy and the defenseless in society also require the care and attention of the law as extended to any other segment of society. If the rule and authority of the law are to reflect the 'rolling on' (*pavattana*) of the *Dhammacakka*, recognition before the law is a basic human right, whatever the circumstances of a victim of discrimination may be.[62]

In the Noble Eightfold Path to the ultimate attainment of *Nibbāna*, the Buddha clearly mentioned to Human Rights through two factors, namely, Right Action (*sammākammanta*) and Right Livelihood (*sammājiva*). The principle of Right Action lead to legal deed which abstain from injuring or killing out of respect for life, property, sexual misconduct, and falsehood i.e. observance of the moral or social virtues, the spiritual implication of the later is that one earns one's living in a way beneficial, and in no way harmful, to other sentient beings. Right Livelihood also recognizes that one needs to earn a living and therefore that everyone has an obligation as well as a 'right' to work with genuine career, which it is without detriment to another one. Victor A. Gunasekara writes, "The Buddha was one of the first to condemn slavery as a right livelihood, and thus ensure this most basic of human rights. No other leader of a major

religion has done so. The Old Testament endorses slavery and this has to be ascribed to Christianity as well. Christianity was used to justify slavery in the US and some of the founding fathers of the US were slave owners. Of course Islam completely endorses slavery and Mohammed himself was a slave owner."[63]

The Buddhist social analysis concentrates upon the extirpation of the desire for gain and self-aggrandizement, the egoistic and selfish drive to own and possess private property, which not only obstructs man's self-realization, but also creates disorder and strife in society and leads to exploitation of man-by-man.[64] Buddhist humanism put forth a humanistic social order in which the right relations between man and man play a significant role in the process of social change.

According to Perera,[65] it is pointed out in the *Dīgha-Nikāya* and its commentary that how rights are assured through the fulfillment of duties and obligations (vide supra) of workers are expected to be ensured through the fulfillment of the following five basic obligations towards labor:

Allocation of work to suit the employee's ability (*yathābalam kammanta-samvidhāna*).[66] Expanding on this point the Commentator further advised that work of young should not be passed over to aged, that of the aged to the young, or that the work-load be exchanged between sexes (*daharehi kātabbam mahallakehi, mahallakehi kātabbam daharehi, itthihi kātabbam purisehi, purischi kātabbam itthihi akāretvā*).[67] This stipulation goes a long way in ensuring just and favorable conditions of work, and also gives recognition to one's ability and choice. This is also shows concern for the fitness of the worker, respect for age and sex, and non-exploitation of female labor; night shifts for women are eliminated. Child labor seems to be unknown.

Provision of food and wages (*bhatta-vetanānup-padānena*).[68] Buddhist humanism enunciates a unique wage policy. Explaining the obligation of the employer to provide 'food and wages', the Commentator state that the circumstances of each person should be separately considered and that wages should be determined according to the number of dependants in the family.[69] For instance a married man with dependent children (*khuddakaputto*) should receive more than a bachelor (*eka-vihāri*).[70]

Ensuring the health-care of employees (*gilān'u-patthāna*).[71] Buddhist humanism required the interesting to the health-care of the workers against health-risks in the course of their work. Under conditions of ill health, says the Commentator, the employee is relieved of duties and resuscitated with medical attention and necessary nutriment (*gilān'upatthānenā ti aplıāsuka-kāle kammam akāretvā sappāya-bhesajjādini datvā patijagganena*).[72] Today this would certainly include insurance against ill health and other employment risks.

Establishing close comradeship with employees (*acchariyānam rasānam samvibhāga*).[73] This, literally means, "by the sharing of unusual delicacies" with the employee. This would certainly push the spirit of comradeship to its peak, resulting in cordial working relations between employer and employee and the sense of a common humanity.

Recognition of the employee's right to leisure (*samaye vossagga*).[74] This implies fixed hours of work. Leisure is explained as two-fold: (1) Release from duties or work at specific times during working hours (*niccasamaye vossajjana*) [75] and (2) seasonal leave granted for festival purposes etc. (*Kālasamaye vossajjana, loc. cit.*).

The individual's right here is without any discrimination to equal pay for equal work. It had been called for in order to eliminate considerations such as those based

on nationality, race, color or sex, which for a long time did, and in some countries still do, determine wage structures. The implied emphasis is that the only criteria for determining wages should be a kind of work, its value to the community, the ability of the worker, and the quality of the work.

A right, as understood today, is an interest protected by law. And human rights, in the view of Buddhist humanism, are interests leading to the welfare of mankind (*bahujanahita and bahujanasukha*) – interests arising due to duty and obligation towards all sentient beings (*parahita*).

Woman's position

One of a question of great interest in the world present-day is equal right of women. The position's women still is enclosed in the role "women produce children; women are mother and wives; women do the cooking, mending, sewing, and washing; they take care of men and are subordinate to made authority, they are largely exclude from high status occupations and from positions of power."[76] Women still do not place the same opportunities as men in society, in politics and at work. The sociologists Vidya Bhushan and D.R. Sachdeva, however, says that it is necessary to "two factors have been primarily responsible for the development of the sociology of women: first the definition of women's position in society as a social problem and second the reassessment of women as people who are just as important as men."[77] Women's condition is described in the Buddha's time as centering round men, adornment, her son and being without a rival.[78] Women were expected ideally to be like slaves and be obedient to their husbands.[79]

Ann Oakley, British sociologists, a supporter of the Women's Liberation Movement (which emerged during the late 1960s in America) has traced the changing status of women in British society from the eve of the industrial

revolution to the 1970s. She claims that, "the most important and enduring consequence of industrialization for women has been the emergence of the modern role of house wife as 'the dominant mature feminine role.'"[80] In similar view, David Lane, a scholar of Soviet Union states, "The position of women in society is more equal to that of men than in capitalist states, but with the family much of women's traditional underprivileged remains."[81] D.H.J Morgan has applied the Marxian concepts of ideology class-consciousness and class solidarity to the position of women in society. Just as the class system is justified and legitimated by ruling class ideology, so the position of women is justified and legitimated by what may be term male ideology.[82]

This interest is not only matter of present-day, but has existed in the ancient society. Before the time of Buddha, women's place is the bottom of society. Women were not allowed to progress and show their creativity and abilities. They were prohibited education, social responsibility and religion. They had to satisfy man, care for her children, and stay in the home. According to Horner, "In the pre-Buddhist days the status of women in India was on the whole low and without honor. During the Buddhist epoch there was a change. Women came to enjoy more quality and greater respect and authority than over hitherto accorded to them." She argues, "For the men, steeped as they were in the Buddhist teachings, not to respond to the constant proofs in daily life of women's powers of devotion, self-sacrifice, courage and devotion." And "Under Buddhism, more than over before, she (women) was an individual in command of her own life until the dissolution of the body, and less of a chattel, to be only respected if she lived through and on a man. The old complete dependence in which the will never functioned but to obey, was gradually vanishing."[83]

How is the attitude of different religions toward women? It is said Jew's women are regarded as inferior,

Islam's women are not allowed to preach or lead in prayer. It is agreed that they have souls but there is no accommodation reserved for them in Paradise. Though the Catholic church teaches a certain respect for women, (for was not the mother of God a women) yet the church still insists on regarding a woman primarily as a potential baby factory whose main duty is to provide the world with plenty of little Catholics, doubtless to ensure the support vitally necessary for its vast ecclesiastical machine and its power structure. In his numerous epistles to the faithful, St. Paul expressed such views as: "A woman must listen quietly in church and be perfectly submissive; I allow no woman to teach or dictate to men; she must keep quiet."[84]

In Buddhist humanism it mentions that no reason why women should be discriminated from the equality especially in matters of moral and spiritual uplift. Nowhere in any of the utterances of the Buddha do we find anything to show that he made any difference between man and woman. Buddha does not recognize rights and freedoms for the male, which cannot be extended, to the female. Women were not treated as inferior to men with regard to the potentialities of spiritual development.[85] Once the Buddha told king Pasenadi of *Kosala* that a daughter well disciplined and educated would prove a better assert than a son.[86] For the first time Buddha affirmed freedom and rights for women. He says, "There seemed to have been no real doubt as to equality of the powers of man and woman."[87] It is clearly to see the equality of Buddhist humanism when the Buddha accepted invitation of Ambapāli's courtesan (who belongs to social ostracism or a low status) to a meal, as well as received the gift of the mango's grove (*ambavana*) from her for the resident of *Saiigha*.[88] He neither scorned nor rebuked courtesans, but tried to help them by making them realize the impermanence of all conditioned things, including the many forms of beauty.

The Buddha opened the gate of free individual for

women which has been just the privilege to man. As Mrs. Rhys Davids puts it, "her head shaved, her dress indistinguishable from the swathing toga of the male religeux, she was free to come and go, to wander alone in the forest shades, or climb and muse on mountain braes." Among Buddha's followers, women take the place important role half of *Saṅgha* consisting fourfold community of *Bhikkhu* (monk), *Bhikkhuni* (nun), *Upāsaka* (lay-man), *Upāsika* (lay-women). The Buddha gives women an independent status and position the same pedestal of equality with man. In the *Etadagga Vagga* (q.v.) of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*[89] the Buddha mentions the name of female disciples who had gained distinction in various fields in the Order. Kisā Gotamī was acclaimed the most experienced *Bhikkhunī*, Khemā as the wisest, Uppalavannā as the best of those who possessed psychic powers, Paṭācārā as the best of those who were experts in the rules of discipline, Dhammadinnā as the best preacher, Nandā as the best of those who meditated, Sonā as the most courageous, Sakulā as the best of those who possessed the divine eye, Bhaddā Kuṇ?alakesī as the cleverest of those who could understand a thing quickly, Bhaddā Kanilāni as the best of those who possessed the power to recall past births and so-forth The *Therigāthā* is full of instances of *theris* who had attained arahantship.[90]

Indeed, as borne out by the *Therigāthā* women actually enjoyed a high degree of intellectual freedom, being able thereby to gain spiritual advancement on an equal basis. To quote N.V. Banargee "If the records in the *Therigāthā* are of any historical value, it may be believed, on their authority, that of the eighty prominent disciples of Buddha as many as twelve including Mahapajapati were women. Of these women who deserve special mention are Khema, wife of king Bimbisara, who gave instructions to king Prasenjit, Dharmadina to whom authorship of the whole *Cullavedalla Sutta* in the *Majjhima Nikāya* is attributed, and Kisa Gotami

who, according to one account, attained *Arhantship* and became the first of those who wear rough robes." [91]

With the coming of Buddhist humanism the traditional structure and functions of society undoubtedly underwent some condition of alterations. Buddhist laywomen is not only in the role to take care of their household and but also to take part in the activity of society, religion and professional posts. Such as the noble lady, Queen Mallikā took a very strong line and on one occasion was able to dissuade her husband king Pasenadi from holding a great animal sacrifice, which had been recommended to him by a *brahman* as a means for saving his life. She was horrified and exclaimed, "Where did you ever hear of the saving of life for only by the death of another? Just because a stupid *Brahman* told you plunges the whole populace in suffering?"[92] Nakulamātā or Nakula's mother and Sāmāvatī were considered by the Buddha to be the most eminent among his lay-disciples for their converse intimately and kindliness with one another.[93] And they were matched in their faith in His Teaching, their self-control, and the affectionate way in which they spoke to one another.[94]

In *Pāli Nikāya* literature the Buddha sometime warns his disciple that women are likening to black snakes, treated as unclean, evil smelling, timid fearful and betrays friends,[95] and are labeled as secretive and not open;[96] they are full of passion, easily angered, stupid and envious and have no place in public assemblies. They are incapable of caring out any business or earning a living by any profession because they are uncontrolled, envious, greedy and stupid.[97] This is not meaning that the Buddha damn woman, because she is often a temptation to man to do evil, but he has only warned weak-minded men against the dangers of her unconscious influence.

DEMOCRACY

The term 'Democracy' in its historical setting had come to mean 'rule by majority decision', and scholars of the subject have analyzed this concept with much finesse.[98] The term derived from the Greek *demoktia* (from *demos*, 'the people', and *kratos*, 'rule', cf. Vedic *kratu*). In English-Pali Dictionary it is found the term *janasammatapālana*[99] that itself meaning 'rule by the people.' Although the classical definitions of the term are too well known to be reiterated here, it has to be stated at the outset that the present-day rapid diffusion of the ideal of democracy has resulted in the term being used (both in concept and application) of systems of government which may no at all be 'democratic' in the original sense. 'Democracy', then is a much-confused term in modern political parlance.

According to scholars in Indian political history[100] varying degrees forms of democratic rule have existed both among the primitive peoples and in the advanced civilizations the world over from *Ṛgvedic* times up to the Buddha's days. And three forms of democracy have been distinguished: (i) 'Direct democracy' or government in which all the citizens as a body, acting under procedures of majority rule, directly enjoy the right procedures of majority rule, directly enjoy the right of making political decisions. This is the oldest form of democracy known to humanity, and was in vogue in the ancient Greek city-states. (ii) 'Representative democracy' in which the same right may be exercised not in person but through representatives chosen by and responsible to the citizens concerned. (iii) "Liberal or constitutional democracy', which is really representative democracy in which majority rule is exercised, as in modern parliamentary practice. This last form of democracy is designed to guarantee fundamental minority rights within any given community in which such rule obtains.[101]

In modern times the term 'democracy', however, seems loosely its signification to denote any form of government or political movement aiming at socio-economic justice- the modus regarded as inconsequential. For instance, the 'People's democracies' of Communism are claiming that the collective ownership of the means of production ensures that the will of the people will be carried out.[102] The present study, it is hoped, will enable an evaluation of these forms of rule in terms of Buddhist thought.

The democratic conception of Buddhist humanism is established as a implement for the furtherance of the human good stems from socio-political philosophy, form an ethical theory. The ethical theory asserts that (the nature of existence being what it is) there is only one way (*ekāyano maggo*)[103] for the perfection of man, and that, as the first step in that direction; a morally good life is a sine qua non.[104] Regarding to this, Jayatilleke says, "This way of life is considered both possible and desirable because man and the universe are just what they are. It is, therefore, justified in the light of a realistic account of the nature of the universe and of man's place in it."[105] Purity in life helps generate the psychological back ground for higher mental development essential for emancipation. Since Buddhist humanist expects one to be concerned not only with one's own spiritual well being but with that of others too, the 'one way' it advocates for human perfection has not only a personal, but a social dimension, as well. So the formation framework of organization of Buddhist humanism demands of the moral life at both the personal and social levels lead to base on the social philosophy and ethic. And, it is mainly through the economic and political affairs of a people that the social ethic of a given religion could be put into practical application.[106] Buddhist humanism would, therefore, opt for that form of polity, which would best enable the practice of its social ethic. In other words, the form of polity accepts right view of life from the Noble Eightfold Path (*aṭṭhañgika-magga*).

Thus it will be noted that although both monarchical and republican forms of government obtained in North India during the Buddha's day, early Buddhist literature shows no preference for one form of government over the other. Buddhist humanism mentioned the term *dasarājadhammā* as righteous kingship and *satta aparihāniyadhammā* as the democratic features have been highly. For instance, in the *Cakkavattisīhanāda* and *Aggañña Suttas* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* "Buddhism measures human affairs in the term of a Universal Norm (*Dhamma* or Righteousness) and also holds that a good end can only reached by good means; a goal by bad means is never advocated. For Buddhism, therefore, it is imperative that the chosen government not only subserves its ends, but also subserves them righteously, i.e., in accordance with the Universal Norm: *dhammen'eva no adhammena*."[107] This conception of a Universal Norm is seen in the view of Jayatilleke as "ultimate sovereignty resided not in any ruler, human or divine, nor in any body governing the state nor in the state itself, but in *Dhamma*, the eternal principle of righteousness," he adds: "This is not to be interpreted to mean that *Dhamma* is some sort of mysterious entity but that it is only to the extent to which state conform with *Dhamma* in their internal and foreign policy that man can achieve his legitimate aspirations for peace, prosperity and happiness."[108] King Indravarman II of *Champa*, a Buddhist monarch seems to have maintained that the heavens themselves are governed in accordance with this principle. Since it is possible to show from the Buddhist point of view that "even in the cosmos as a whole, it is merit and desert that count and all are equal before the cosmic justice of *Dhamma*,"[109] and that "any man of his own free will[110] may aspire to and attain the status of a *Brahmā* or Buddha." It can well and truly be said that the universe, in Buddhist humanism, is conceived on the democratic model and it is against this background that the view of democracy as a polity among mankind has to be examined.

The *Dhamma* or the Universal Norm operating in the terrestrial realm has to seek expression through institutions of human polity, and this may be possible through many forms of government. As the *Cakkavattisīhanāda Sutta* suggests, it should really be through moral reform, and the chosen form of polity of a given people should be respected.[111] To the Buddha the success of a political administration deepened on the measure to which such an administration acted in consonance with the *Dhamma* "as revealed by, or as implied in the socio-ethical concepts" enunciated by him."[112] Since Buddhist humanism credits the human personality with a dignity and a moral responsibility, it would look upon every human being as qualified to be vested with the sovereignty immanent in the *Dhamma*, in the management of human affairs. Buddhist humanism would agree with Jean Jacques Rousseau that the assumption of man's responsibility for his own governance "is of the essence of human dignity"[113] and that "no man can without degrading himself beneath the level of humanity, be denied a personal share in the making of basic political decision."[114] As Rousseau's defense of this proposition is considered today a "decisive contribution to the theory of modern democracy,"[115] it may be noted that the teachings of the Buddha should also be regarded as consonant with democratic thought at its best.

The *Aggañña Sutta* suggests that at a critical stage in the prehistoric evolution of human society man deemed fit to effect a social contract for the management of his affairs. It is said that in the course of social evolution property rights had to be established and this was affected through mutual agreement. "Now, those beings gathered together and bewailed these things, saying: From our evil deed, sirs, becoming manifest, inasmuch as stealing, censure, lying, punishment have become known, what if we were to select a certain being who should be wrathful when indignation is

right, who should censure that which rightly by censure and should banish him who deserves to be banished. But we will give him in turn a proportion of the rice. Then those beings went to the being among them who was the most handsomest, the best favored, the most attractive, the most capable, and said to him: Come now, good being, be indignant at that whereat one should rightly be indignation, censure that which should rightly be censured, banish him who deserves to be banished. And we will contribute to thee a proportion of our rice. And he consented, and did so, and they gave him a proportion of their rice. Chosen by the whole people is what meant by Mahā Sammata;[116] so Mahā Sammata (the Great Elect) was the first standing phrase to arise Lord of the Fields is what is meant by *Khattiya;* so *Khattiya* (noble) was the next expression to arise. He charms the others by the Norm or Righteousness (*dhamma*) is what is meant by *Rājā* (ruler); this was the third standing phrase to arise."[117]

From viewpoint of this *Sutta* it can says that the democratic view in Buddhist humanism, which took place according to the Norm or *Dhamma* that between them and all the rest, is not tribal or blood disparity. They were selected, set apart, for the performance of certain duties. Each of them fulfilled the ideal of a noble, which included not only righteousness, but also other things. Jayatilleke speaks, "According to the Buddhist theory of social contract, sovereignty in the sense of the supreme legislative power is vested in the people as a whole."[118]

The *Ulūka Jātaka* gives more information on the mechanics of electing a ruler as anticipated in the political system of Buddhist humanism which it is described in the metaphor from the story of assembled birds elected an owl as their king, a crow took objection to such an individual because of defective appearance. The crow gave his objections against the election of owl, listing his arguments.

Having listened to the arguments, another bird moved that the assembly should take a vote on the matter in view of the new objections to elect their king.[119] It is not only in the case of electing a ruler, but also during the period of his rule, public opinion was considered vital. As long as the king ruled the country according to the law (*dhamma*), which symbolized the celestial wheel, remained in the sky without moving away.[120]

Furthermore, Buddhist humanism expounds the criteria or important qualities for the selection a ruler as following:

a. The ruler was to be well born on both sides (i.e. on the side of the father as well as the mother), with no slur cast on him on account of his birth.

b. He was handsome, pleasant in appearance, inspiring thus, gifted with great beauty of complexion, fair in color, fair in presence, stately to behold.

c. He was mighty, with great wealth, and large property, with a store of silver and gold, of aids to enjoyment, of goods and corn, with his treasure houses and his granaries full.

d. He was powerful, in command of the army, loyal, disciplined, in four divisions (of elephants, cavalry, chariots and bowmen), burning up methinks, his enemies by his very glory.

e. He was a believer, and generous and noble given, keeping open house, a welling-spring with *sramanas* and *brahmanas*, the poor and the wayfarers, beggars and petitioners might draw, a doer of good deeds.

f. He was learned in all kinds of knowledge.

g. He knew the meaning of what had been said, and could explain: 'this saying has such and such a meaning, and that, such and such.'

h. He was intelligent, expert and wise, and able to think out things present or past or future.[121]

These criteria or qualities are necessary maintaining democratic institution, as well as guaranteeing rights and happiness for man because of the overwhelming power that a ruler would possess.

Community movement in Buddhist humanism is imbued with the spirit of democracy. It is the fact that the man is free to follow any politic system of his choice so long as it would righteously (*dhammena*) pave the way for the pursuit of the Buddhist ideals; the corporate life of the Buddhist *Saṅgha* is harmony in the polity governing a *āvāsa* (monastic colony) illustrates the point.[122] For administrative purposes each *āvāsa* governed itself through its own Ecclesiastical Acts (*saṅghakammas*), which it is necessary that all the qualified members at the *āvāsa* (monastic colony) should assemble. Anyone unable to attend should remain for the time being 'outside the boundary' (cf. *nānāsīmāya ṭhita*)[123] or should send his consent (*chanda*)[124] by proxy. Of course, for difference kinds of *Saṅghakammas* quorums are prescribed, but not committees. What obtains here is 'direct democracy' in that an attempt is made to secure the participation of every qualified member of the *āvāsa* (monastic colony) in the act concerned. In fact one may wonder whether the staking out of *āvāsa* (monastic colony) cannot be construed as an attempt to implant firmly in the mind of the *Saṅgha* the concept of 'direct democracy' as opposed to 'representative democracy' to which the establishment of a central monastic organization would have invariably led. However, as far as present-day large and pluralistic lay societies are concerned, Buddhism should naturally be expected to opt for 'representative democracy' as the only practicable alternative (*supra*).

It shows that in both conception and execution of a

Saṅghakammas is completely democratic. Quorums, committees, resolutions, proclamations, voting, and such-like democratic procedures were all known and referred to by their technical terms.[125] The unanimous consent is considered necessary.[126] If there be a division of opinion, it becomes a case of *adhikarana* or dispute (*vivādādhikaraṇa*) which should be settled in accordance with the rules for the settling of such disputes.[127] Amongst these rules, one with a special significance for the Buddhist conception of democracy needs to be singled out for emphasis. This is known as the *yebhuyyasikā*, in which the majority vote is recognized.[128] However the important in the procedure adopted, "the democracy (of the Buddhist community of monks) was based upon adult franchise i.e. the vote of *Bhikkhus* who were over 20 years of age. But the first thing, which they were expected to fulfill, was a certain standard of education and training according to certain rules of discipline under learned *Bhikkhus*. The second was that the assembly in which the business of the *Saṅgha* was to be conducted must not be a part, but complete including all monastic members of a specified area."[129] And it is made for special step to ensure that the majority vote is in consonance with the *Dhamma* - the eternal principle of justice, virtue, and righteousness without killing or causing to kill, without conquering or causing to conquer, without grieving or causing to grieve.[130] The meetings in the spirit of democracy (*uposatha*) of Buddhist religious community has periodical at every fort-nightly to ensure the moral purity of their conduct and remedial action was taken if any member of the community was found to be guilty of any transgression. By presence what is good and rules through *Dhamma*, poverty, ill-will, violence, and wrongdoings do not exist in his domain that ensures a peaceful. In history, Emperor Asoka of ancient India was perhaps the only one who could really be called a *Cakkavattin* (Universal monarch) who

reigned as righteously as possible by extending his empire across almost all of the subcontinent "respected, revered and honored the *Dhamma,* while using the *Dhamma* as a standard, as a sign, as a sovereign, providing for the proper welfare and protection of the people. This cardinal constitution of the democratic conception in Buddhist humanism is also found today by the British tradition, "Most Englishmen would agree that the majority, acting through proper parliamentary channels has a legal right to do anything it wishes, but would also agree that there are many things a majority has no moral right to do, and that if those things were attempted, even by act of parliament, they would still be in violation of the principles of the constitution."[131]

The word "democracy" used to describe this harmonious society is simply a name based on one perspective of its structure. The emphasis is on administrative power, which is in the hands of the people. They have the freedom to choose themselves actions, and each takes responsibility for those choices. They will consider beforehand whether or not their choices are conducive to the benefit of the community. But if we look from a different perspective, we might call it something else, such as in the distant past in India when such a political system was called the system of harmony (*samaggadhamma*). It is the real heart of a democracy and is what ensures its stability and success. For instance, in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta,* the Buddha mentioned the key to prosperity of a country *Vajjian* (*Skt: vajjika*), that is, harmonious relations of man in society, which it based on the foundation of the concord and unanimity.

From the foregoing observations Buddhist humanism's every significant stipulation is considered of the term *dhammika* or righteous, which the norm's the best among this folk, both in this world and in the next.[132] It would value and hold in esteem whatever that is democratic in any given form of polity. It would minimize dissension and causes for

conflict of race, country, locality, and religion; create harmony in individual and society. Thus Buddhist humanism spread the seed of democracy the equality in the ancient time as the factor of harmony in society. K.N. Jayatilleke says that the Buddha should be accredited with the honor of establishing a democratic institution "for the good of its members as well as of mankind so that it may continue to function on a democratic basis after his death."[133]

FREEDOM

As the matter of freedom many scholars debate it. Some of them argue, "Buddhism does not appear to have solved the antinomy of free will, except by teaching without any subtlety that right action is a part of the Noble path."[134] According to conditioned Genesis it is said that the question of free will has occupied an important place in western thought and philosophy. While this question does not and cannot arise in Buddhist philosophy Not only is the so-called freewill not free, but even the very idea of free will is not free from condition.

As opposed to these arguments, Trevor Ling maintains that "the Buddha's insistence on the real possibility of human choice and freedom of action, and his opposition to fatalism differentiate his teaching from that of the Ajivakas."[135] Jayatilleke asserted the reality of human freedom or free will without denying at the same time that this free will was conditioned but not wholly shaped or determined by factors, which affected it. Freedom of choice is the very basis of Buddhist ethics. The very possibility of our refraining from evil and doing good depends on the fact that our choices and decisions are not strictly and wholly determined and in this sense are free. Thus Buddhism upheld a theory of non-deterministic causal conditioning along with the doctrine of free will.[136]

In the *Devadaha Sutta*[137] of *Majjhima Nikāya* it can sees the grounds of Buddhist humanism looking for freedom of man. It criticizes the view upholds that all human present experiences of pleasure and pain are entirely due to past actions (*pubbekatakammahetu*). If past actions entirely control our present experiences man has no chance of shaping his destiny. Another rejection deems that all human experiences are due to creation by God (*issaranimmanahetu*). If such were the case man not be held responsible for the good and evil that he does, because ultimately it is God who is responsible for everything in the universes. It rejected to view that beings are destined by experience pleasure and pain due to fate (*saṅghatibhāvahetu*). If such fatalism operates in the universe it is just not possible to make an end of suffering, and leading a religious life becomes meaningless. Or it rejects the all view of experiences are due to hereditary physiological causes (*abhijātihetu*).

In *Dīgha Nikāya*, it not accepts deterministic theory, which Makkali Gosāli[138] credited that the experience pleasure and pain of being had no initiative, the person is devoid of free-will, effort, will-power, dignity, self-determination or effort of their own. They are going on through a process natural evolution, according to a fixed determination (external) law. It also repudiates the theory of annihilation which denied moral causation altogether.[139] Another refutation is *adhicca-samuppannavāda* or Accidentalism which denies causation altogether and maintains that events take place fortuitously. Naturalism (*sabhāvavada*) belonged to the materialists (among whom Ajita Ksakanbali was the leader). According to their theory '*sabhāva*' (nature) is the external principle which controls everything animate and inanimate in the world, 'man is what he is comprised of was their concept of man, what he does or does not it is his nature,' which is impossible to change they said.

Rejecting all those varieties of deterministic theories as well as indeterministic (*ahetuappaccayavada*) the Buddha claimed the theory of causally conditioned free-will of man (*attakāra*). Emphasizing the potentiality of man, in a situation where the secondary conditions are desirable, to select the best alternative from several others. The Buddha accepted the probability of everyone in society to refrain from unwholesome acts and to engage in wholesome acts. In the *Sampasādaniya Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* rejecting Gosala's theory the Buddha thoroughly stressed, " There is personal endeavor (*attakāra*) human effort (*purisakāra*) human strength (*purisathāma*) human vigour (*purisaviriya*) human energy (*purisa-parakkama*) and responsibility (*purisadhuraggeha*)."[140]

In *Devadaha Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, *Titthayatana Sutta* of *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and in several other places the Buddha criticized this theory on the ground of free will of man. A *brahmin* presented a similar argument to the Buddha that free-will is not unconditioned, but free-will itself is a strong condition. The Buddha answering the *brahmin* explained that one who comes to a certain place willfully could go back after his intention to come there is satisfied. That is his free-will. One should not forget that through the whole process, every moment is conditioned. However among the other conditions man's free-will has become superior. To explain the view of a *bramin* that man has no free will (*natthi attakāro, natthi parakāro*), in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* the Buddha says that there is an element of initiative (*ārabbhadhātu*), an element of exertion (*nikkamadhātu*), an element of endeavor (*parakkamadhātu*), an element of resistance (*thāmadhātu*), an element of persistence (*ṭhitidhātu*) and an element of volitional effort (*upakkamadhātu*) in man.[141]

Buddhist humanism says that freedom is the absence of restriction or limitation, which derived from the term *Pāli vimutti* (skt: *vimukti*). It's meaning often quoted – 'the right to act or speak so long as it does not violate the rights of

others'. That is, one is free to speak or act conditionally, or thought under the limitations and restrictions of the law. Freedom in meaning is the readiness to give others a chance. Without to give others a chance that liberty only is a product of selfishness. It must be the meaning of coexistent balance and harmony in personal liberty and the liberties of others. This is conditional freedom. There is another kind of freedom, which lies on a more profound level. In order to have true freedom on the outer level, it is essential to have inner, mental freedom. This is unconditional freedom. It explains, in the *Mahātaṇhāsaṅkhaya Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* that the man's freedom is limited (*parittacetaso*) in condition when his mind adheres to the sense of pleasant and unpleasant. On the other hand, the man who does not get attracted by pleasurable sense data and repelled by unpleasant sense data has a mind that is described as unlimited (*appamānacetaso*).[142] Mental freedom is freedom from oppression by the defilements of greed, aversion and delusion, or craving, conceit and views, which force our minds to fall, deviate from what is true (*Dhamma*). It is said that true free when the mind is freed from all defilements, man is able to look at things as they really are. And man is recognized, as one who is enlightened has attained the truth. Thus, Buddhist humanism only brings out man form of unlimited or unconditional freedom that it is essential for the attainment of outer freedom. We can survey here some aspects of freedom follow as:

Freedom of thought

The Buddha is first vanguard in the field freedom of thought. He sought the way of freedom and the end of suffering through the development of wisdom. His advice was not only to depend on theories, on cults and gurus but strongly advocated the doctrine of self-reliance, purity, courtesy enlightenment, peace and universal love. It is completely different to religious founders as Jesus of

Catholicism or Mohammed of Islam, the Buddha was meditating to gain enlightenment no gods came to whisper in his ear to reveal hidden secrets of spiritual power, and no one gave him any commandments or religious laws to introduce. What he achieved for enlightenment - that is by his own effort, energy knowledge and purity of supreme wisdom without any teacher or divinity to teach or tell him how to gain.

Buddhism humanism advocates self-confidence, self-restraint, self-reliance and self-purification to the individual in society. In the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, before his passing away the Buddha advised gently to his followers that "be ye lamps unto yourselves. Be ye a refuge to yourselves. Betake yourselves to no external refuge. Hold fast to the Truth as a lamp. Hold fast as a refuge to the Truth. Look not for refuge to any one besides yourselves."[143] It is the way that a person will reach liberation from all suffering. Why did he not advise everyone to find salvation through him? Why did he counsel man should not seek salvation by depending on others but himself?

The attitude of Buddhist humanism to freedom of thought is sought in the *Kālāma Sutta* of *Aṅguttara Nikāya*.[144] There the Buddha admonished the Kālāmas not to accept a proposition as true on the criteria of the revelation, tradition, heresy, scriptural authority, logic, inference, superficial observation, plausibility and prestige-value of the teacher. One should accept only on grounds of personal conviction, and when the resultant consequences of such acceptance are seen to be useful in the light of experience. In Buddhist humanism it is destitute of thought of imposition, which support that one, should be guided by the sound attitude for the choice of oneself. In his teachings the Buddha expects everyone come to investigate (*samannesati*) and examine (*upaparikkhati*) as those prescribed to the Kālāmas. Such as in the *Vīmaṃsaka Sutta*[145] and the *Caṅki Sutta*[146] of *Majjhima*

Nikāya the Buddha invites his disciples to see whether his physical and verbal behavior betrays the presence of any defilement such as greed, hatred and ignorance. It is also find in the *Brahmāyu Sutta*[147] of *Majjhima Nikāya* the young man Uttara who followed the Buddha like a shadow for seven months to verify the validity of the fame that had spread about the Buddha.

Buddhist humanism upsets the false view of dogmatism and fanaticism (as another name by which dogmatic adherence to views) is an intellectual fetter. However, as *Aṭṭhakavagga*[148] of the *Sutta-Nipāta* too emphasizes, the dogmas of philosophy are not easy to overcome, amongst the *Dhammas* is adopted after consideration. It is obstinate clinging in standpoint that this alone is true and all else in false. This reason causes that man is limited in himself freedom of thought, or be obstructed to the acquisition of knowledge well as.

Freedom of Expression

The field towards the freedom of language, freedom expression of ideals is also discussed here in Buddhist humanism. Knowing in advance obstructive matter from the point of view of language as a medium of instruction, in *Aranavibhanga Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha says that one should learn his teachings 'in one's own language' (*sakāya niruttiyā*) and prohibited his disciples from presenting his teaching through any privileged linguistic medium of the day.[149] He believed that the mother tongue allows anybody to understand and express ideas better and more freely. It is recorded that the Buddha has been against the idea of rending the *buddhavacana* (the word of the Buddha) meter i.e. Sanskrit, the language of the elite of the day.[150] The opinion freedom of language in Buddhist humanism demolished the distinct wall of race, language, etc . And the

Buddha's *Dhamma* actually can bring to the bond of sympathy developed for human on the platform of knowledge.

Speech is one of the three modes of human activity but to get real free in speech person have to distinguish between what is beneficial and all what is harmful to one. In other words, person should speak skillfully, to use the tongue to profit and to advantage, should avoid from lying and slander, harsh speech, to indulge in frivolous conversation, or to use abusive language towards anyone. In the *Abhayarājakumāra Sutta*[151] of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha says that only what is true and useful should be spoken, and that too at the proper time. There may be occasions when harsh language is useful for disciplinary purposes; apart from such exceptional circumstances one should train oneself to use words, which are pleasant and polite. But if one does not have something true and useful to say, and if it is set the proper time even if one has, it is best to observe noble silence (*dhammī vā kathā ariyo vātuṇhībhāvo*).[152]

Buddhist humanism also demands the attitude of unruffled when man confront with the language of criticism and praise. In the *Bramajāla Sutta*[153] of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha says that one should not get angry if another were to criticize one, for the simple reason that one will not be in a position to see whether the criticism is valid or not be in a position to see whether the criticism is valid or not if one gets angry. Nor should one be elated if someone praises, because elation prevents one from seeing whether those qualities for which one is praised are found instead one should maintain an composed attitude as self-correction, if necessary, becomes possible only then.

Freedom of worship

Buddhist humanism did not try to gain adherents by

force or coercion that it contains a full-fledged philosophy of life. It teaches man ways and means of ordering all aspects of life so that man could lead a well-integrated holistic life, in harmony with one another and with nature. Buddhist humanism accepts that there could be certain aspects of other religious and philosophies that are true and useful to man, though they may not answer all problems man's suffering as absolute solution. The spirit of Buddhist humanism is due to man and benefit to man although those men belonged to any of caste, politic, or religion. The problem from criticizing and confronting other religions as well as comparing and contrasting with other views[154] is not the interesting matter of Buddhist humanism. However, there is harmful views propagated, Buddhist humanism made it a point to clearly expose the vanity and damage of such views and supported such arguments with sound reason, evidence and experiential facts.[155]

In the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha speaks in praise that so long as the *Vajjian* continues to patronize their places of worships and follow their religious customs they will prosper and not decline. This statement clearly shows the respectful no polemical attitude of Buddhist humanism adopted towards other religions.

Freedom of action

Buddhist humanism exhorts that man who is given his freedom of action as the prominent role. the Buddha asserted that man possesses an element of initial effort (*ārabbhadhātu*), personal action (*purisakāro*) and own actions (*attakāro*), and that there are in man the elements of exertion (*nikkamadhātu*), of endeavour (*parakkamadhātu*), of strength (*thāmadhātu*), and of preseverance (*ṭhitidhātu*) which make him act of his own accord in various ways.[156] It is obvious that man has the capability to choose between alternatives. But it isn't the

meaning that people could do what they please or desire. The desire for selfish, the desire for personal advantage and satisfaction (desire for consumption), the desire for eminence and greatness, the desire for importance or power over others (desire for dominance or influence), desire for others to accept one's views might be harm for owns one, either they will cause society in chaos and the relation of man to man in the condition of destruction. That is why, in the *Ambalaṭṭhikā Rāhulovāda Sutta*[157] of *Saṁyutta Nikāya* the Buddha advised that one should reflect on before doing an action whether it is conducive to harm to oneself and others. Because man has the freedom to choose his action he is responsible for his deeds and he reaps what he sows (*Yādisaṃ vapata bijaṃ tādisaṃ harate phalaṃ*).[158] Man should choose what is conducive to his own well-being and happiness and live as an island or lamp unto oneself, he must help himself another cannot help him (*attadipā viharatha attasaraṇā*).[159]

To be lacking in wisdom, man who is easily failed into state evil habits loses much of his free will. One addicted to drugs or alcohol is a slave to his habit; he has no control over himself. Though he suffers a great deal physically and mentally because of his evil habit, he has no strength of character to shed the end habit. He not free to do so because he is conditioned to the extent of being unable to the extent of being unable to use the element of free will with which he, as a human being, is endowed. He is bound and fettered by his evil habits (*saññutto hoti*). The *Aṅguttara Nikāya*[160] explains how a fetter (*saṃyojana*) is formed: One ponders over and entertains thoughts of those things, which provoke exciting desire. As he does so craving arises in him. When he craves for those things he gets fettered (*saññutto hotu*). This is what the Buddha calls a fetter (*saṃyojana*).

Evil deeds (*akusala*) as killing, stealing, etc. are that prompted by unwholesome motivational root (*akusalamūla*)

such as lust (*raga*), hatred (*dosa*) and delusion (*moha*).[161] It is significant that these motivational roots are said to circumscribe a man's freedom of action *rāgo pamānakaraṇo, dosa pamānakaraṇo, moha pamānakaraṇo.*[162]

Man cannot obtain himself freedom when is dominated so much by sense faculties (*indriyāni*). The *Chapāna Sutta* of *Saṁyutta Nikāya*[163] illustrates the state of the untrained man like six animals viz. snake, crocodile, bird, dog, fox, and monkey that have different habits and diverse fields of action are tied together in one firm knot. Just as there is much turmoil with the activities of these different animals, the sense faculties of the untrained man are constantly trying to reach their respective fields of action. The man has no control over his sense faculties is much confused in freedom of choice. If the man who has control over his sense faculties, it is freer to choose between alternatives.

How is one's sense faculty's fetter? The *Mahāsalāyatanika Sutta*[164] of *Majjhima Nikāya* explains in detail that one does not understand as it really is, the nature of the eye, the nature of visual objects, the nature of visual consciousness, the nature of visual contact, the nature of pleasurable, painful and neutral sensations that arise as a result of visual contact: without such realistic understanding he gets attached to the eye, visible objects, visual consciousness, visual contact, and the sensations that arise thereby. When he is attached (*sāratta*) he gets fettered (*saniyutta*) and loses much of his free will. Being deluded he lives seeing the pleasurable aspect of the visual experience and thereby his rebirth personality builds up (*ayatim pafic'upādānakkhandhā upacayam gacchanti*). His physical and mental tensions (*darathā*) increase, physical and mental torments (*santāpā*) increase, and physical and mental fevers (*parilāhā*) increase. He experience suffering (*dukkha*) of both body and mind.

Man is advised to possess of freedom himself even by

ruling over evil states of the mind just as strong man would overpower a weak man (*cetasā cittaṃ abhinigganhitabbaṃ abbinippiletabbaṃ abhisantāpetabbaṃ*).[165] One must try to take the mind under one's control (*cittaṃ vasaṃ yattati*) and not go under the control of the mind (*no ca cittassa vasena vattati*).[166]

The man who commits evil and indulges in sense pleasures is described as one who is going down the stream (*anusotagāmi*),[167] like one who is drifted down by the stream.[168] He hardly uses his free will. Succumbing to natural inclination (*yebhuyyena sattā kāmesu palātilā*)[169] he gets completely entangled and fettered within and without (*antojaṭā bahijaṭā jaṭāya jaṭitā pajā*).[170] The one who cultivates moral habits and restrains his senses is well on the path to freedom and is described as one going upstream (*patisotagāmi*).[171] Subduing his physical sense faculties he develops spiritual faculties (*indriya* q.v.) such as *saddhā* (faith), *viriya* (energy), sati (mindfulness), *samādhi* (concentration), *paññā* (wisdom).[172] When these spiritual faculties get further strengthened they become spiritual powers (*bala* q.v.) such as *saddhābala* (power of faith), *viriyabala* (power of energy).[173] Some of these powers are then developed to become factors of enlightenment (*bojjhanga* q.v.).[174] It brings about total steadfast freedom of mind (*akuppā cetovimutti*). He then has complete control over his mind (*cetovasippatta*).[175] He is able to entertain; he is equally capable of not entertaining whatever thoughts intentions, he does not want to entertain. He has come to a state of unconditioned (*asaṅkhata*)[176] freedom from bondage (*yogakkhema*),[177] and that state is generally known as *Nibbāna*.

In brief, Buddhist humanism provided ideas for social base through dialectical thought and spiritual relationship, to participate in a spiritual fraternity, believing that "man is not fundamentally a material being driven by the instincts of production and reproduction."[178]

The social structure of Buddhist humanism brings harmony for individual and society through the door of wisdom (*paññā*) and loving-kindness (*mettā*), which is built on the fundamental of equality, democracy and freedom. In mutually independent of equality, democracy and freedom, relationships in the life of men and women of any race and community are gradually improved – That is opportunity that people can develop their social potential.

It can says that the social structure of Buddhist humanism as the key to the growth of each individual who makes up each part in the structure of the organization. It is proper way of being for the organization is to always grow progress and develop, always together with the times, always in rhythm with the times.

References

1. Vidya Bhushan and D.R. Sachdeva, '*An Introduction to Sociology*', Kitab Bahal, 43th Edition (2002), p. 372.
2. Ṛgveda, x, 90, 12
3. P.E.D, Ed. by T.W. Rhys Davids & William Stede, Oxford (1905); New Delhi & Madras (1997) s.v. '*vaṇṇa.*'
4. D. III, p. 68 ff.
5. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, '*Manual of Buddhism for advanced Students*', p. 192.
6. S. I, p. 75.
7. See A. III, pp. 384-386.
8. Sn. v. 142.
9. D. I, pp. 87 ff.
10. M. II, pp.147 ff.
11. M. II, pp. 196-197; Sn. vv. 594-611.
12. M. II, pp. 129 ff.
13. M. II, pp. 180 ff.
14. H. Oldenberg, '*The Buddha*', p. 156
15. Dial. I, p. 102
16. A. IV, p. 202.
17. R. Flick, '*The Social Organization of North-East India in Buddha's Time*', p. 335.

18. Charles Eliot, '*Hinduism and Buddhism*', Vol. I, p. xxii.
19. Celestin Bougle, '*Essays on the Caste System*', p. 73.
20. Ibid.
21. E. Senart, '*Caste in India*', p. 205.
22. Max Weber, '*The Religion of India*', pp. 225-227.
23. D.P. Chattopadhyaya, '*Lokāyata*', People's Publishing House (1973), pp. 466-467.
24. Mhvg., pp. 35-37.
25. D. I, p. 77; cp. A. II, p. 419
26. D. III, p. 64.
27. D. III, p. 85 ff.
28. D. III, p. 98.
29. M. II, pp. 126-127; M.L.S. II, p. 309.
30. M. II, p. 128.
31. M. II, pp. 88-89; M.L.S. II, p. 277.
32. Vidya Bhushan and D.R. Sachdeva, '*An Introduction to Sociology*', Kitab Bahal, 43th Edition (2002), pp. 380-381.
33. Gandhi, M.K., '*Hindu Dhamma*', p. 34.
34. Damien V. Keown, Charles S. Prebish, Wayne R. Husted (Ed.), 'Buddhism *and Human Rights: Are there Human Rights in Buddhism?*' Curzon Press (1998), p. 23.
35. Perera, L.P.N., '*Buddhism and Human Rights: A Buddhist Commentary on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*', Colombo: Karunaratne and Sons (1991), p. xi.
36. Inada, Kenneth K., '*The Buddhist Perspective on Human Rights*' in Arlene Swidler (ed.), '*Human Rights in Religious Traditions*' (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982), p. 70-71.
37. Dhp. v. 160.
38. Dhp. vv. 131-132.
39. O.H. de A.Wijesekera, '*Buddhism and Society*', Colombo (1952), p. 22.
40. L.P.N. Perera, '*A Buddhist Commentary on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*', Colombo (1991), p. 32.
41. See A. I, pp. 147, 254.
42. See A. I, p. 147.
43. A. I, p. 188 ff.
44. D. III, p. 180 ff.
45. D. III, p. 113.
46. K. N. Jayatellike, '*The Principles of International Law in Buddhist Doctrine*', Extract from the '*Recuil des Cours*', Vol. II, 1967, (Private Circulation only), Leiden, p. 518.

47. Cf. D. II, p.152; S. II, p. 21; V, p. 200; Sn. v. 102.
48. Cf. K.N. Jayatillke, op, cit., pp. 515 1ff; G.P. Malalasekera and K.N. Jayatillake, *'Buddhism and Race Question'*, UNESCO, 1958, pp. 35 ff.; E.O.B, Vol. V, Fascicle I, s.v. *Egalitarianism.*
49. Sn. vv. 600-611.
50. D. III, p, 93; v.l. *aññesam* (ibid., p. 93, fn. 12) should be preferred to *anaññesam* in the text of the PTS Edition.
51. E. Barker, *'Social Contract'*, Oxford University Press, London, and Reprint 1948, p. xii f.
52. D. III. 93.
53. Sn. vv. 116-142.
54. M. II, p. 83.
55. Dhp. vv. 129- 130.
56. S. V. 352 ff.
57. A. I. 188 ff.
58. K.N. Jayatilleke, op. cit., p. 478.
59. K.N. Jayatilleke, op. cit., p. 447.
60. .O. B., Vol. V, Fascicle III, s.v. *Human Rights.*
61. D. III, p. 61.
62. E.O.B., Ed. by G.P. Malalasekera, Vol. V, Fascile 3, s.v. *'Human Right.'*
63. Victor A. Gunasekara, *'A Comparison of the Doctrines of Humanism and Buddhism Considering their Similarities and Differences'*, see http:/ / www.google.com, s.v *'humanism.'*
64. DR. Jatava, *'The Humanism of Buddha'*, Jaipur (1998), p. 36.
65. E.O.B., Ed. by G.P. Malalasekera, Vol. V, Fascile 3, s.v. *'Human Right.'*
66. D. III, p. 191.
67. DA. III, p. 956.
68. D. III, p 191.
69. DA. III, p. 956.
70. Ibid.
71. D. III, p. 191.
72. DA. III, p. 956.
73. D. III, p. 191.
74. D. III, p. 191.
75. DA. III, p. 956.
76. M. Haralambos with R.M. Heald, *'Sociology Themes and Perspectives'*, Oxford University Press, 1980, p. 369.
77. Ibid. p. 404.
78. A. II, p. 76.

79. A. III, pp. 224, 361-367.
80. See '*Sociology Themes and Perspectives*', p. 373.
81. Ibid. p. 393.
82. Ibid. p. 402.
83. Horner, I.B., '*Women under Primitive Buddhism*', London (1930), p. 1f
84. See International Encyplopaedia of Buddhism, Vol. II, tr. by Moffatt, s.v. '*Women in Buddhism.*'
85. Theri. p. 61.
86. S. I, p. 86.
87. I.B. Horner, '*Women under Primitive Buddhism*', London (1930), p.104.
88. D. II, p. 78.
89. A. I, p.25.
90. Theri. pp. 126, 129, 131
91. N.V. Bannerjee, '*Buddhism and Marxism: A Study in Humanism*'. Orient Long man Ltd. (1978), p. 272.
92. Kh. I, p. 286.
93. A. I, p. 26.
94. A. II, p. 62.
95. A. III, p. 260.
96. A. I, p. 282.
97. A. II, p. 83.
98. E.B, 14th Ed. by Philip,W. Goetz, s.v. '*Democracy*'.
99. E.P.D., Ed. by A.P. Buddhadatta Mahāthera, London (1955); Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Reprint 1989, 1997.
100. P. Basu, '*Indo-Aryan Polity*', London, 2nd Ed., 1925; K.P. Jayaswal, '*Hindu Polity*', Calcutta, 1934, and Romilla Thapar, '*A History of India*, Vol. I, Penguin Books, Reprint 1969.
101. E.B., 14th Ed. by Philip,W. Goetz, s.v. '*Democracy*'. Also cf. Ere, Vol. 6, s.v. '*Government*'.
102. Cf. Y. Todorsky, '*Democracy in Action: Soviet Military Review*', August 1976, No. 8, pp. 2 ff.
103. Cf. S. V, p. 168; Dhp. v. 274.
104. Cf. S. V, p. 187; Miln. p.33 f.; Vism. p.6 ff.
105. K.N. Jayatilleke, '*The Message of the Buddha*', a posthumous work, ed. Ninian Smart, London (1975), p. 240. Also cf. K.N. Jayatilleke, '*The Principles of International Law in Buddhist Doctrine*', Leiden (1967), Vol. II, p. 479 f.
106. Cf. O.H. de A. Wijesekera, '*Buddhism and Society*', Colombo (1952), p. 15.

107. Cf. D. III, p. 83 f.
108. K.N. Jayatilleke, *'The Principles of International Law in Buddhist Doctrine'*, p. 478. Also cf. Dial. I, p. 80, fn. 3.
109. K.N. Jayatilleke, loc. cit.
110. K.N. Jayatilleke, op. cit. p. 518; also cf. ibid. p. 478.
111. D. III, p. 61. Cf. the advice of the *Cakkavatti* Monarch to the Rules coming under his way that they should be morally good and should carry on the administration as before.
112. O.H. de A. Wijesekera, *'Buddhism and Society'*, Colombo (1952), p. 15.
113. E.B., Vol. 7, p. 180.
114. Ibid, p. 180.
115. E.B., Vol. 7, p. 180.
116. Mahā Sammata is name of a first king of the solar race in the beginning of time and the legendary ancestor of many lines of kings (among others of the kings of the *Sākiya* clan).
117. D. III, p. 93.
118. K.N. Jayatilleke, Hague, 1977, p. 127.
119. J. p. 270.
120. D. III, p. 60.
121. S.B.B, Vol. II, p. 175-176.
122. See S. Dutt, op. cit., pp. 120 ff.
123. Cf. Vin. I, p. 320.
124. Vin. I, p.121 f.
125. Cf. Vin. I, pp. 316 ff. et Vin. II, p. 95 ff.
126. Vin. I, pp. 319.
127. Vin. II, p. 93 ff.
128. M. II, p. 247; Vin. II, pp. 84-97.
129. Gokuldas De- XV, 1965.
130. S. I, pp. 116-117.
131. E.B., Vol. 7, p. 182.
132. D. III, p. 94 f.
133. K.N. Jayatilleke, op. cit., p. 520.
134. Thomas E.J., *'The life of Buddha'*, London (1956), p. 207.
135. Trevor Ling, *'The Buddha'*, Penguin books (1976), p. 141.
136. K.N. Jayatilleke, *'Ethics in Buddhist Perspective'*, Kandy, pp. 1-14.
137. M. II, p. 222; cf. A. I, pp. 173-175.
138. D. I, p. 53; DA. I, p. 161.
139. D. I, p. 55.
140. D. III, p. 106.

141. A. III, p. 337.
142. M. I, p. 270.
143. D. II, p. 100.
144. A. I, p. 188.
145. M. I, p. 318.
146. M. II, p. 172.
147. M. II, p. 135.
148. Sn. vv. 832, 780-787, 878 ff.
149. The language of the privileged *Vedic* idiom at that time in North India
150. Vin. II, p. 139.
151. M. I, pp. 394-395.
152. M. I, p. 161.
153. D. I, p. 3.
154. M. III, pp. 298 ff.
155. M. II, pp. 147-157.
156. A. III, p. 337 f.; cf. A. I, p. 173 ff.
157. S. V, p. 9.
158. S. I, p. 227.
159. D. II, p. 100.
160. A. I, p. 264.
161. M. I, p. 47.
162. S. V, p. 297.
163. S. IV, p. 198.
164. M. III, p. 287.
165. M. I, pp. 120-121.
166. M. I, p. 214.
167. A. I, p. 243.
168. Iti. p.114.
169. A. III, p. 5.
170. S. I, p. 13.
171. A. II, p. 5.
172. S. V, p. 202; M. II, pp. 11-12.
173. S. V, p. 219; M. II, pp. 11-12.
174. S. V, p. 111; M. II, pp. 11-12.
175. A. II, p. 36.
176. S. IV, p. 359 ff.
177. A. II, p. 12.
178. Jacobson, N.P., *'Buddhism'*, London: Allen (1996), p. 27.

5

The Transcendence of Ethics

THE SIGNIFICANCE AND SOURCE OF ETHICS

Introduction of Ethics

The term 'Ethics', according to Odhams Dictionary of the English Language Illustrated as well as some scholars mentioned, derives from the Greek 'ethikos', that which pertains to 'ethos', character. It is also called 'Moral Philosophy', from the Latin custom. Popularly, 'Ethics' is described as 'the science treating of moral.'[1] In his Principia Ethica, dealing with the question what is good or bad in human conduct, G. E. Moore proceeds to declare: "I may say that I intend to use 'Ethics' to cover more than this-a usage for which there is, I think, quite sufficient authority. I am using it to cover the general enquiry into what is good."[2] K.N. Jayatilake states, "Ethics is concerned with the notions of right, duty, good and just, all of which are used in connection with the acts of persons while the later two are used in reference to persons themselves or with corporate concepts such as a social order, state or a government."[3]

The Buddhist ethics is built on the vast conception of universal love and compassion for all living beings which is required into human conduct, behavior, goals, dispositions, intentions, ways of life and institutions. It also signifies a mode of philosophical inquiry, which attempts to answer certain general questions about the meaning of moral terms

and the criteria of moral evaluation. In contemporary philosophy a distinction is made between two approaches to philosophical ethics. The first is viewed as a normative inquiry, which attempts to determine the distinctions between right and wrong, good and bad and ought not in relations to the moral evaluation of human action. The second approach is viewed as an analytical and logical exercise called meta-ethics attempting to clarify the meaning of moral words, analyze moral concepts and describe the logical status of moral utterances.

As the analytical philosopher (*vibhajjavādin*) Buddha revolutionized the traditional metaphysical ethics and ritualistic conduct. For that reason, he is criticized by *brahmins* as non-actionalist (*akiriyāvādin*) for refuting all traditional ethical concept and practice which clearly verify Buddha's critical attitude towards determinism (*niyativāda*), theism (*issaranimmāṇavāda*), soulism (*āttavāda*), asceticism (*tapacaraṇa*), priestism (*porohitavāda*), castism (*jātivāda*) etc. as false ethical concepts and practice. There is also a deep-rooted misconception prevalent among modern scholars who consider Buddhism's ethics only mere revival of *Vedic* or *Upanishadic* ethics as they found the *Vedic* terms i.e., *kamma* (action), *pāpa* (bad), *puṇya* or *puñña* (good), *karuṇā* (compassion) etc. in Buddhist Canon.

In the propagating, however, ethical thought of Buddhist Ethics, it is said that these terms filled with different connotations. The two terms of traditional practices that popular in the Buddha's day were known as *Brāhmaṇical* practices were attached with sacrificial ritual resulting in injury to animal life, reflecting insensitivity to the pain of other sentient beings, and *Samaṇical* practices were involved with meaningless vows and penances resulting in the afflictions of the body. In fact, the Buddha is not only against the false opinion of the moral tradition, but also give a moral redefinition of these terms. A *Brāhmaṇa* is redefined as one

who has rid himself of moral evil (*bāhita pāpattā brāhmaṇo*) and a *Samaṇa* as one who has calm down the evil dispositions (*samita pāpattā samano*).[4] The moral reform movement of Buddhist humanism also can see, "That, Kassapa is a common say in the world that the life of a *Samaṇa* and of a *Brāhmaṇa* is hard to lead. But if the hardness, of that life depended merely on this asceticism, on the carrying out of any or all of those practices you have detailed, then it would not be fitting to say that the life of the *Samaṇa*, or the *Brāhmaṇa*, was hard to lead. It would be quite possible for a householder, or for the son of a householder, or for any one, down to the slave girl who carries the water-gar, to say: 'Let me now go naked, let me become of low habits,' and so on through all the items of those three lists of yours. But since, Kassapa, quite from these matters, quite apart from all kinds of penance, the life is hard, every hard to lead; therefore is it that it is fitting to say: 'How hard must *Samaṇaship* be to gain, how hard Brāhmaṇaship must be!' For from the time, O Kassapa, when a *Bhikkhu* has cultivated the heart of love that knows no anger, that knows no ill-will from the time when, by the destruction of the deadly intoxications (the lusts of the flesh, the lust after future life, and the defilements of delusion and ignorance), he dwells in that emancipation of heart, in that emancipation of mind, that is free from those intoxications, and that he, while yet in this visible world, has come to realize and know – from that time, O Kassapa, is in that the *Bhikkhu* is called a *Samaṇa*, is called a *Brāhmaṇa*."[5]

"Not to do any evil, to devote oneself to doing well, and to purify the mind, this is the teaching of the Buddha(s)."[6] This Buddha's teachings can be transferred into ethical terminology which offers any individual or society a voluntary way of thought and practice based upon an analysis of human morality which promotes human welfare and well-being, and aims at the realization of the truth of human life and finally at freedom from suffering.

The ethics of Buddhist humanism initiates the effort to practice inner purity and inner transformation of the spiritual progress. Practice of morality needs effort and determination. The Buddha advising a disciple who was worried about observing many precepts in the community of *Saṅgha* asked him to protect at least one thing. He asked the disciple to protect his own mind.

The ethical conduct of Buddhist humanism lies under the term '*sīla*' which is defined as nature, character, habit, and behavior. In popular sense, it is expressed as morality, virtue, moral deeds, and moral principles and so on. The traditional sense further goes to describe it as a basic foundation of moral life or the pivotal point of the holy life.[7] In the *Visuddhimagga*,[8] *Sīla* is interpreted in three ways, namely, foundation stone (*sīlana-atthena*), calming down (*sītala-atthena*) and acting as forerunner (*sira-atthena*). The cultivation of *sīla* (ethical conduct) consists of an attempt to change our patterns of behavior in such a way that it will ultimately lead to a radical transformation of our dispositional traits.

The significance of Ethics

It is said that the ethics is the subject which discussed excitingly in the many schools as well as thinks. But what the transcendence of ethics is that Buddhist humanism deals with this subject as the prerequisite condition able to conduct appropriate benefit for humankind.

In his 'Ethics of Buddhism', however, Tachiabana believes that the enlightened person in Buddhism is 'beyond good and evil.' It implies that the highest goal of Buddhism is amoral and has a personal and mystical significance. This is related to the idea set forth in the *Upanishads* knowledge exempts the knower from both good and evil and emancipates him altogether from the region of moral

distinctions.[9] Contrary to Tachiabana's belief the evidence in *Pāli Nikāya* shows that the ultimate knowledge admitted in Buddhist humanism has a moral purpose. It is the kind of knowledge that puts an end to the evil dispositions that are deep-rooted in the human mind.

Buddhist humanism is against the theistic point of view (*issaranimimānavāda*), so that "whatsoever happiness or suffering (*sukham vā dukkhaṃvā*) or the state of neither suffering nor happiness mankind (*purisapuggalo*) experiences, all that is due to the creation of the Lord."[10] For materialistic doctrines, a human being is simply built up of the four elements of earth, fire, water and air and of nothing else: at the time of dissolution, whatever is composite, including human personality, is reduced to the primary elements: there are no moral values, good and evil deeds, nor their results: all events are strictly determined by physical constitution and natural forces.[11] For Fatalism (*saṃsāra-suddhivāda*: lit. the theory of Purification, through transmigration), Non-causationalism (*ahetukavāda*), and Non-actionalism (*akiriyavāda*), human beings will after an allotted period of transmigration automatically come to the end of this suffering; there is neither cause nor condition for the depravity or the rectitude of human beings; the attainment of any given condition, of any character, does not depend on human act, will to act and effort; man is devoid of individual action, of human potentiality, of human power, endeavor, strength and effort (*natthi attakaaro natthi purisakaaro, natthi balaṃ, viriyaṃ, purisaparakkamo*), there is neither human action nor will to act nor effect of action nor efficacy of action, and thus man cannot help himself.[12] The term ethic is the notion, not of the ideal human inter-relations, but of the conformity of the individual to a divine standard. God as absolute moral perfection is the ideal of righteousness.

As 'Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics' mentioned, Buddhist humanism differs from this in two ways: It

recognizes no God in the sense of ultimate reality of ontology; and it makes *Nibbāna* consists not in the attainment of moral ideal but in the escape from existence.[13] It considered 'man as man' in the world of conditional existence, not determined by something beyond man, but by himself alone, whose present and future lies in his own hands, who has absolute responsibility for his own destiny and who is capable of improving his life and attaining the emancipation.

A closer look of the Buddhist humanism, one is advised to develop them, without referring to the so-called supernatural grace, one should prevent the arising of evil things that have not arisen, eliminate those which have already arisen, make arise good things, which have not arisen, and preserve, increase, fully develop, cultivate and perfect those which have arisen.[14] The bodily, verbal and mental activities of man make moral responsibility for a reality and self-development a practical possibility, ennobling his nature and regulating his future betterment. In other words, man should be the master of himself without there is any other master. This is what is often emphasized in the statements: "live ye as islands unto yourselves, as refuges unto yourselves, taking no other as your refuge; live with the doctrine (the norm) as your island and with the norm as your refuge, taking no other as your refuge."[15]

Buddhist humanism also rejected the views that purity results of man from cling to various vows and rituals (*silabbata-parāmāsa*), bathing in sacred rivers, keeping to rituals of fasting, adhering to various kinds of taboos in connected with food, going about naked, wearing one's hair in a particular way or dressing oneself in a specified manner, performing various sacrificial rites in the forest praying to superhuman deities It exhorted that just as a stone thrown into the water can never be made a float by wishing and praying even so an evil person who had died could not be made to enter heaven by the wishful thinking and praying

of other people. Despite such wishing and praying he would definitely enter the world of misery. In fact, by mere wish, hope or even idle prayer, one can in no way attain what one wishes and hopes for; but only by exercising one's own energy, actualizing one's own potentiality and applying oneself to what is desired one can attain what one wants.[16]

In the *Tevigga Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha illustrates in instance "Again, Vāseṭṭha, if this river *Akiravati* were full of water even to the brim and overflowing. And a man with business on the other side ... should come up and want to cross over. And he, standing on this bank, should invoke the other bank, and say, 'Come hither, oh further bank! Come over to this side! Would the further bank ... by reason of that man's invoking and praying and hoping and praising come over to this side?" "Certainly not". "In just the same way, Vāseṭṭha do the *brahmans*... omitting the practice of those qualities which really make a man a *braman* and adopting the practice of those qualities which make a man non-*brahmin*, say thus, 'Indra we call upon, Soma ... Varuṇa ... Isāna ... Pajāpati... Brahmā...we call upon', verily, that those brahmins ... by reason of their invoking, praying and hoping and praising, should, become united with the Brahmā - verily, such a condition of things can in no wise be."[17]

Man is the creator of his own world, the master of his own life, the controller of his own fate and destiny under the causal law of action (*kamma*); man's condition his station in life, his sorrow and happiness and so on-depending upon his own deeds under his own responsibility. The merit or demerits of actions performed by man accumulate, and, in the course of time, acquire a vital potency. In this connection Buddhist humanism encourages the earnest pursuit of a course of go action for the betterment of moral existence of mankind and strengthens human potentiality to succeed in striving after human welfare and well being. The Buddha claimed "I do not declare, monks, that intentional actions

done and accumulated there can be a wiping out without experiencing, more or less in one way or another (the result thereof), whether it would arise in this visible state or in some other state hereafter."[18] In other words, a doer of good experiences good, while a doer of evil experiences evil, just as one who sows the seed reaps the fruit thereof.[19] The causal law of action also states experiences evil can be diminishing, if one is to firmly resolve to stop repeating such bad action from evil thought, selfishness, hatred, anger jealousy, grudges, and ill-will, to cultivate more and better action. In *Aṅguttara Nikāya* it is illustrated as a man throws a grain of salt into a little cup of water that water in the cup would become salt and undrinkable thereby; a man throws a grain of salt into the *Ganges* River that mass of water in the *Ganges* River would not become salt and undrinkable thereby. Just in the same way of person does the small offence that takes him to hell; or yet again a similar the small offence of another person is to be experienced in this very life – there is living of the holy life, there is opportunity manifested for the utter ending of ill.[20]

In the *Cūḷakammavibhāṅga Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the *brahmin* youth, Subha asked the Buddha, "What the cause, the reason, that lowness and excellence are to be found among human beings while they are in human form? For, human beings of short life-span are to be seen and those of long life-span; those of many and those of few illnesses; those who are ugly; those who are beautiful; those who are of little account, those of great account; those who are poor, those who are wealthy; those who are of lowly families, those of high families; those who are weak in wisdom, those who are full of wisdom? The Buddha declared: "Deeds are one's own, beings are heirs to their deeds, deeds are matrix, deeds are kin, deeds are arbiters. Deed divides beings that are to say by lowness and excellence." (*kammassakā māṇava sattā, kammadāyadā, kammayoni, kammabandhu kammapaṭisaraṇā*

kammaṃ satte vibhajati yadidaṃ hinappaṇitatāya)[21] Thus, whatever actions men do either good or bad, they are bound to them[22] and responsible for them.[23]

A man attains its superiority or inferiority by his own action. "*Na jaccā vasalo hoti, na jacca hoti brahmano kammunā vasalo hoti, kammunā hoti Brāhmano.*"[24] Dhammaratana had said, "It is not birth that makes a man mean, nor is it birth that makes a man noble. It is the conduct that makes a man mean, and it is the conduct that makes a man noble."[25] It may be said conduct is the most important aspect of religions, philosophical thoughts, that is, especially, in Buddhist philosophy as righteous conduct. It impels an individual to seek that, which is regarded as the best. It is said man's fundamental nature to be good and in this respect the mind of man is compared to a piece of gold ore, which is said to have the defilement of iron, copper, tin, lead and silver but when it is purified it shines with its natural luster, as when he attains the transcendent mind.[26] However, due to lack of knowledge and understanding, people may confuse between good and bad elements. This is why precepts are necessary in the practice of moral discipline. They provide definite guidelines and help to avoid some of the confusion that empirical observation and social conventions may entail.

An examination shows that it is also not found the character of an authoritarian moral system or is understood as conformity to the commandments of a supreme moral lawgiver in Buddhist humanism. There is a sense in which it can be said to have admitted moral autonomy in that it leavers room for the moral agent to solve his own moral problems by his own intelligent analysis of moral situation. However, this freedom granted in Buddhist humanism does not allow a moral agent to make his moral commitments according to his whims and fancies. There are facts about human nature and criteria, which any rational moral agent should be conscious of when he is making his own moral

decisions. The morality of an act is not to be determined on the basis of conformity to the commands of a moral authority. One can claim to be a moral authority only if one makes the appropriate moral judgments. The Buddha's understanding of morality is claimed to be linked to his understanding of human nature and the human predicament. This is an understanding, which is shared by all enlightened beings that are entitled to an equal to the knowledge and insight into moral truths.

There is evidence that Buddhist humanism attempted to have a distinct moral impact on society through a critique of existing social and political institutions. The Buddha rejected the Brahmanical value system by denying that the worth of a human being depends on his birth or caste. Buddhist humanism maintained that the greatest man is one who is endowed with knowledge and ethical conduct (*vijjācaranasampanno so seṭṭho devamānuse*).[27] Brahmanical myth of creation, which led to the belief that caste distinctions are divinely ordained, is replaced in Buddhist humanism with its evolutionary account of the world, society and social institutions.[28]

In presenting this evolutionary account, Buddhist humanism attempts to uphold its ethical stand by showing that attachment or craving is the cause of regression from an excellent to a baser condition of human life. It maintains that the moral education (*sikkha*) of those exercising the highest authority in society such as the rulers (kings in the context of the widely prevalent monarchical order of society in which the Buddha preached) and administrators are a prime requirement for a stable, harmonious and just society. When those exercising authority at the higher levels of society are morally corrupt, it affects the entire moral fabric of society. It is established on the foundations of a theory of reality, which is claimed to be based on the form of *Dhamma* as the

crucial factors to purify 'a piece of gold ore' in the man's mind.

Source of Ethics

To contrary in the Occident moral insight grows from living- relationships which collect from the group or corporation, the ethical process concern with human personality of Buddhist humanism is such that the avoidance of evil and cultivation of good along with the purification of the mind tends to make man and his life better and happier; that there is an assertion of a state or the final goal with the means of attaining it-the state of perfection, ultimate freedom and bliss to be obtained only when man's mind is absolutely pure and cleansed of all defilements.

In fact, every good and bad action of one is performed by mind. Mind plays a very important role in the philosophy of Buddhist humanism. In the *Dhammapada*, Buddha teaches, "All that we are the result of what we have thought (mind): it is founded on our thoughts, it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with an evil thought, pain follows him, as the wheel follows the foot of the ox that draws the carriage," "All that we are is the result of what we have thought: it is founded on our thoughts, it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with a pure thought, happiness follows him, like a shadow that never leaves him."[29]

Therefore, in the *Ambalatthikārāhulovāda Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*,[30] the Buddha advises his disciples should consider the action by body, speech or thought in terms of consequences. Checking on the consequences is recommended as a necessary requirement for the moral agent before, while and after performing an action. If any action found to lead to harmful consequence to oneself, to others and to both, that is, harm consequences in general it is to be

determined to be an *akusala* action. If it is found to have the opposite consequences of promoting one's own happiness and welfare and the happiness and welfare of others it is to be determined to be *kusala* action.

In the *Kālāma Sutta,* the Buddha told the Kālāmas that there is a way in which they could know by themselves what is good and bad.

"Now what do you think, Kālāmas, when greed arises within a man, does it arise to his benefit or harm?

- To his harm, Sir.
- Now Kālāmas, when a man is greedy, is overcome by greed, when his mind is completely swayed by greed, does he not kill a living creature, take what is not given, commit adultery, tell lies, and induce others too to commit deeds that would conduce to disadvantage and unhappiness for a long time?
- He does, Sir."[31]

The Buddha made the same remarks with reference to malice and delusion. The Kālāmas finally admit that greed, hatred and ignorance are the traits that are *akusala* (morally bad) and that ought to be avoided (*sāvajja*). They also admit that they are the traits that are censured by the wise and that to act from those traits of character involve ill and suffering. The Buddha is instructing the Kālāmas not to depend on moral authorities, but to make their own autonomous judgments on moral questions. It is advised to Kālāmas, "But when you know for yourself that these things are immoral, that these things are blameworthy, that these things are censored by the wise, that these things when performed and undertaken, could ruin and cause sorrow... then indeed do reject them." "And when you know for yourself that these things are moral, that these things are blameless, that these things are praised by the wise, that these things when

performed and undertaken, conduce to well-being and happiness... then do you live and act accordingly."

However, in using their judgment in coming to autonomous moral decisions, the Buddha assumes there are grounds that rational beings need to consider. They are required to pay attention to the happiness or unhappiness produced by the course of conduct that they decide to follow.

The moral question raised by the king Pasenadi of *Kosala* regards to the rational criterion necessary for making a distinction between praiseworthy and blameworthy behaviors is said in the *Bāhitika Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*.[32] Ānanda (a renowned disciple of the Buddha) is asked what bodily verbal and mental conduct is censured by spiritually elevated persons (*samaṇa brāhmaṇa*) and wise man (*viññū*). Initially Ānanda answers that they censure behavior, which is *akusala*. The king wishes to push his question further, for, to say that some type of behavior is *akusala* is to censure it, and it does not answer to his satisfaction why it is censurable. The king asks Ānanda, what type of conduct is *akusala*. Ānanda answers that it is the type of conduct that ought to be avoided. This answer, too, does not satisfy the king, for the answer is still within the sphere of the 'ought'. On being questioned further, Ānanda finally defines *akusala* behavior as that which involves injury or harm (*savyāpajjha*).

The both terms *kusala* and *akusala* is also called as skillful mental states and unskillful mental states which is regarded as the primary moral evaluation in Buddhist humanism. The *Aṅguttara Nikāya* uses evaluative language in characterizing the specific modes of behavior and conditions of mind which conduce to the attainment of the ultimate goal of the Buddhist humanism.[33] All action, whether individual or socially oriented, always stem from skillful mental states and unskillful intentions. The Buddha is said to have reflected on the fact that he himself abandoned the numerous evil

and unwholesome qualities and attained perfection in the numerous *kusala* qualities.[34] The Buddha was venerated for possessing morally good qualities. He is referred to as one who cultivated that which ought to be cultivated and eliminated that which ought to be eliminated, which may be understood among other things as a reference to his cultivation of *kusala* and elimination of *akusala*. In the context of answering certain questions asked by king Pasenadi of *Kosala*, Ananda says that the Buddha is one who has discarded all states that are *akusala* and possessed of states which are *kusala*.[35]

To declare in brief what the meaning of *akusala* is, the Buddha mentions these three psychological states of greed (*lobha*), malice (*dosa*) and delusion (*moha*).[36] These three are considered as primary disposition with result in diverse kinds of moral evil. The numerous patterns of bodily, verbal and mental behavior characterized in Buddhist humanism as *akusala* are said to be the natural expression of these dispositions.

A heap of *akusala* (the basic unwholesome dispositions) is presented in several variant forms of psychological disposition. Such as the five hindrances to the supreme knowledge, namely, the intense urge for sensuous gratification (*kāmacchanda*), maliciousness (*vyāpāda*), sloth and torpor (*thīnamiddha*), flurry and worry (*uddhaccakukkucca*) and doubt (*vicikicchā*). The unwholesome dispositions are sometimes enumerated as varieties of *āsava* (influxes or cankers) and *anusaya* (dormant evil tendencies of the mind). What is *āsava* (influxes or cankers)? The term '*āsava*' is used in the sense of a force that pollutes the *citta* (consciousness) and *cetasika* (factor of consciousness), which is called *akusala-citta* and *akusala-cetasika*. It finds in the meaning 'mental intoxicant' consisting of the four types as sensuality (*kāma*), lust of life (*bhava*), speculation (*diṭṭhi*) and ignorance (*avijjā*).[37]

In some passages it stands for the 'out flow' or 'influx' of spirit and the 'intoxicating extract' or 'drugs' made from the fermented flowers or fruits.[38] The first two types of *āsava* may or may not be poisonous. But the *āsava* of the rest types is always poisonous. Three particular psychic factors of the sense of *āsava* are lust of life (*bhava*), speculation (*diṭṭhi*) and ignorance (*avijjā*) that is not only intoxicant but also poisonous in their inherent nature. Their intoxicated factors exist and function in the beings of all planes of existence right from the very lowest level of the hellish world to the highest form of existence.[39] These psychic factors functions like a latent potential corrupting force, in the changing flow of the five aggregates of infatuated being from an indefinite past and continue to flow for an indefinite future till that being does attain the *gotrabhū-citta*.[40]

Akusala deeds of body and speech proceed from unwholesome tendencies, which are deep-rooted of minds. These deep-rooted tendencies in turn are the consequence of certain repeated patterns of behavior. Any single action performed has the tendency to be repeated and to be gradually built into a general pattern of behavior. Particular acts of body and speech feed the unwholesome dispositions and evil traits that are already deep-rooted in our minds, and strengthening them. *Kusala* culminates in the eradication of the defilements of mind (*kilesa*), which is the way leading to the spiritual bliss of *Nibbāna*. It is known in grouping as *dasa-kilesa-vatthūni* (ten defilement of mind) is *lobha* (greed), *dosa* (hate), *moha* (dullness), *māna* (conceit), *diṭṭhi* (speculative opinion), *vicikicchā* (perplexity), *thīna* (stolidity), *uddhaca* (distraction), *ahirika* (un-conscientiousness), *anottappa* (disregard of blame).[41] In other brief words, *kilesa* (vices) consists of *rāga* (sensuality), *dosa* (hatred) and *moha* (lust).[42]

Buddhist humanism recognized the attitude to what was good (*puñña*) or bad (*pāpa*), right or wrong that takes into account three components involved in an action. The

first is the intention that motivates the action, the second is the effect the doer experiences consequent to the action, and the third is the effect that others experience as a result of that action. If the intention is good, rooted in positive mental qualities such as love, compassion, and wisdom, if the result to the doer is wholesome and if those to whom the action is directed also experience a positive result thereof, then that action is good, wholesome or skillful (*kusala*). If, contrary, the action is rooted in negative mental qualities such as aversion and egotism, if the result experienced by the doer is negative and unpleasant, and if the recipients of the action also experience undesirable effects from the action, then that action is unwholesome or unskillful (*akusala*).

ETHIC EDUCATION

Ethical Conduct

The *Pāli* scripture enumerates *sīla* (ethical conduct) in great detail in relation to the spiritual stations and aims of a person. To depending on the seriousness with which the goal of emancipation is sought, Buddhist humanism gives much attention difference moral precepts for both householders as well as religious.

Lay people who are referred to enjoy the pleasures of sense (*gihī kāma bhogino*), engaged in activity productive of material pleasures and comforts are difficult to admit the perfect life. However, Buddhist humanism identifies that the layman is also considered to be capable of attaining the higher goal if he cultivated *pañca-sila*, the *aṭṭhanga-sīla*, or *dasa-sīla*. *Pañca-sila* is called five items of good behavior are (1) *pāṇātipādā veramaṇī*, i.e. abstinence from taking life; (2) *adinnādānā veramaṇī* (from) taking what is not given to one; (3) *abrahmacariyā* adultery (other-wise called *kāmesu micchācārā veramaṇī*); (4) *musāvādā veramaṇī* telling lies; (5)

surā-meraya-majja-pamādaṭṭhānā veramaṇī viz. abstaining from any state of indolence arising from (the use of) intoxicants.[43] This *pañca-sīla* is also considered as the basic assumption of moral activities in Buddhist community. The first precept is related to abstinence from taking life (*pāṇātipādā veramaṇī*). Killing is an immoral deed, which could be done by six ways, namely, by one's own hands; by giving instructions to someone else; by shooting; by digging trenches; by mantras or occult practices; and by supernatural power. The second concept is taking what is not given to one or abstaining from stealing (*adinnādānā veramaṇī*). Stealing is possible through six ways, namely, by one's own hands; by false measures and weights; by force; by concealment; by design; and by forgery. The degree of depravity is low or high depends on value object of stealing. Furthermore it is stated that the stealing has low depravity in the case of an object belonging to one inferior in virtue and the stealing object, which belongs to the distinguished one for his virtue, entails a greater crime and the degree of depravity is also high.[44] The third precept is in connection with adultery or sexual misdeed (*abrahmacariyā* or *kāmesu micchācārā veramaṇī*). In this precept, the lay-devotees are advised only sexual intercourse with their counter-parts; while Buddhist religious who have taken the vow of celibacy preserving from sexual intercourse. It is stated that a person who observes these conduct properly has full control over his senses and attains perfection to lead a happy life. The fourth precept prohibits telling lies (*musāvādā veramaṇī*) or the uttering of falsehood. It appears of fourfold expression to wit falsehood, slander, bitter speech, and idle babble.[45] The fifth precept is dealing with abstaining from any state of indolence arising from (the use of) intoxicants (*surā-meraya-majja-pamādaṭṭhānā veramaṇī*). This intoxicants conduct to uncontrolled mind which is in the *Sigāla Sutta*, the Buddha shows the six dangers in drinking viz. actual loss of wealth, an increase in quarrels, stretching

of disease, loss of good character, indecent exposure, impaired intelligence.[46]

As regards to the importance of *pañca-sīla* in the *Kūtadanta Sutta*, the Buddha says, "When a man with trusting heart takes upon himself the precepts - abstinence from destroying life; abstinence from taking what has been given; abstinence from evil conduct in respect of lusts; abstinence from lying words; abstinence from strong, intoxicating, maddening drinks, the root of carelessness – that is a sacrifice better than open largesse, better than perpetual alms, better than the gift of dwelling places, better than accepting guidance."[47] In Gunasekara's comparison, it finds the eleventh principle of new Humanist Manifesto is more or less similarity to the primary precepts of Buddhist humanism. He writes, "The fact that the five precepts of Buddhism can be extended into the modern context shows that the Buddha's ethical precepts do not become dated simply by the passage of time. The ethical precepts of Buddhism do not contain any specifically religious requirements."[48]

The *aṭṭhanga-sīla* or the eight pledges which are recommended to the Buddhist layman in *aṭṭhanga-samannāgata uposatha* (the fasting-day with its eight constituents). They are the items (1)–(5) of *pañca-sila;* (6) *vikāla-bhojanā* (*-veramaṇi*) not eating at the wrong hour; (7) *nacca-gīta-vādita-dassanāsikkhāpada* to avoid worldly amusements; (8) *mālā-gandha-vilepana-dhāraṇa-maṇḍana-vibhūsana-ṭṭhānā-sikkhāpada* to use neither unguents nor ornaments.[49] *Dasa-sīla* or ten items of good character (not "commandments") are the numbers (1)–(4) of *pañca-sila;* (5) *pisuna-vācāya* slander; (6) *pharusa-vācāya* harsh or impolite speech; (7) *samphappalāpā* frivolous and senseless talk; (8) *abhijjhāya* covetousness; (9) *bvāpādā* malevolence; (10) *micchādiṭṭhiyā* heretic views.[50]

It is a spiritual movement of those who were already

disenchanted the ordinary pleasures of the world and were seeking for something believed to be higher. A life of renunciation of the ordinary sensuous pleasures was considered to be a primary requirement if one's immediate goal was to attain moral perfection. Perfection in these *sīla* (ethical conduct) is said to be one basic reason why the Buddha is praiseworthy.[51] *Dasa-sikkhāpadāni* or the ten *sīla*, which are recommended to one, is entering the Buddhist *Saṅgha* as a novice an initiate (is called *sāmaṇera*). They are the items (1)–(8) of *aṭṭhanga-samannāgata uposatha;* (9) *uccā-sayana-mahā-sayanāsikkhāpada* not to sleep on a high, big bed; (10) *jātarūpa rajata-paṭiggahaṇā-sikkhāpada* not to accept any gold or silver.[52] The more elaborate *sīla* mentioned in relation to the life of renunciation, which it is known as *pātimokkha samvara saṃvuto* (one restrained according to the rules of *pātimokkha*). Three special tracts on morality are found in *the Sāmaññaphala Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*. It contains of the *Culla-sīla* (the short paragraphs on conduct), *Majjhima-sīla* (the longer paragraphs on conduct), and *Mahā-sīla* (the long paragraphs on conduct).[53] The whole of these three *sīlas* is called *sīlakkhandha* (and is grouped with *samādhi-* and *paññākkhandha*).[54] The *Bhikkhu*'s life also expected to rule by the 227 *sīlas*, and 311 *sīlas* for *Bhikkhunī* (nun). The *Pātimokkha* deals with the rules, which are obligatory for higher ordained monks and nuns.

	Pātimokkha	***Bhikkhu***	***Bhikkhunī***
1	*Pārājika* (defeat)	4	8
2	*Sanghādisesa* (formal meeting)	13	17
3	*Āniyata* (undetermined)	2	
4	*Nissaggiya-Pācittiya* (forfeiture)	30	30
5	*Pācittiya* (expiation)	92	166
6	*Pāṭidesanīya* (confession)	4	8
7	*Sekhiya* (training)	75	75
8	*Adhikaraṇa samatha* (Procedures of settling disputes)	7	7

Pātimokkha was to restrain the bodily and verbal behavior. Good is the control of the body and good is the control of the worlds: good is the control of our whole inner life. When a monk has achieved perfect self-control, he leaves all sorrows behind."[55]

It also mentioned to eight *sīlas* (ethical conduct), namely, *sammāditthi* (right understanding), *sammāsamkappa* (right thought), *sammāvācā* (right speech), *sammākammanta* (right action), *sammājiva* (right livelihood), *sammā-vāyāma* (right effort), *sammāsati* (right mindfulness), *sammāsamādhi* (right concentration) which they established the path of enlightenment. In the study, Prof. Kewal Krishan Mital states, "Buddha's ethical teachings are summed up under the Eightfold Path."[56] In fact these eight *sīlas* is based on a certain psychological theory about the levels at which immoral traits of the mind function. According to Buddhist humanism immoral behavior can be explained at a more fundamental level by reference to its deeper psychological roots, which these factors are known as 'The Fruits of life of a recluse' (*sāmaññaphala*).[57]

At the higher level of emancipation Buddhist humanism also recognized moral conduct as *Saṅghavatthūni, Brahmavihāra, Visuddhi, Bodhisattva-pāramī. Saṅgaha-vatthūni* or objects (characteristics) of sympathy are the behavioral level of *dāna* (giving), *peyavajja* (liberality), *atthacariyā* (kindly speech), *samānattā* (a life of usefulness). The term *dāna* (giving) is considered literally in meaning of giving. The Buddhist humanism depicts that is the sacrifice of a personal possession for the benefit of others, whatever the possession may be, as material wealth knowledge, expertise or labor. The dissemination of the *Dhamma* is considered as the greatest *dāna* (*sabbadānaṃ dhammadānaṃ jināti*),[58] as a gift bringing most beneficial to the recipient. Furthermore, *dāna* (giving) is the more significant conception stands for a virtue, which has a much wider connotation. It is the best antidote

for the unwholesome character traits such as greed, miserliness, selfishness, malice and lack of concern for the welfare and well being of others. *Peyavajja* (liberality) is the cultivation of good speech, which opposed to the four modes of evil speech mentioned under the abstentions required of *sīla*, namely, false speech, harsh speech, slanderous speech and frivolous speech. One should speak pleasant words conducive to happy of the individual and society. *Atthacariyā* (kindly speech) is the conduct, which means service for the welfare of others. The meaning of *Samānattā* (a life of usefulness) is moral action without non-discriminatory behavior. It is to be guided by the sentiment that other persons are the same as my own person.

The term '*Visuddhi*' deals with seven stages of purification viz. purity of moral habit,[59] purity of mind, purity of view,[60] purity through crossing over doubt,[61] purity of knowledge and insight into the way and what is not the way, purity of knowledge and insight into the course,[62] purity arising from knowledge and insight.[63]

Bodhisatta-pāramīta is the ten perfections of a person aspiring to become a Buddha viz. the path of virtues of *dana* (giving), *sīla* (moral temperament), *nekkhamma* (renunciation), *paññā* (wisdom), *virya* (endeavor), *khanti* (forbearance), *sacca* (truth), *adhiṭṭhāna* (resolute determination), *mettā* (loving), *upekhā* (equanimous).[64]

Social Morality

Beyond the personal level and the emancipation of the individual, Buddhist humanism provides a simple code of morality as social morality for the harmony of the family, society and nation. The practice of which will strengthen the solidarity of a community.

In the *Sigālovāda Sutta* it consists of the mutual performance of duties and responsibilities towards its family

members, social members. The Buddha has given the kinds of advice for people to respect and to fulfill their duties in relationships between parents and children, husbands and wives, teachers and pupils, lay community and the spiritual community. In fact, Buddhist humanism emphasizes people's mutual duties for the problem of social injustice instead of emphasizing 'right' in the sense of claims, due to its insistence on a philosophy of detachment and egolessness.

The family is considered as a social unit, within which many the values of Buddhist humanism can be put into practice that promotes a responsible and dutiful relationship of mutual love and respect. The parent-child relationship recommended in Buddhist humanism is meant to promote a mutual sense of security to both parents and children. In five ways, a child should minister to his parents that having supported him, he will support them; he will do their duties; he will keep the family tradition; he will make myself worthy of my inheritance; furthermore he will offer alms in honor of my departed relatives. And in five ways, the parents ministered to their children, show their compassion that they restrain them from evil; they encourage them to do well; they train them for a profession; they arrange a suitable marriage; at the proper time they hand over their inheritance to them.[65] *Aṅguttara Nikāya* records that great approval is accorded to families where the parents are held in high respect. The Buddha considered them as Brahma rank (*sabrahmakāni*) and with the early great teachers (*sapubbacariyakāni*); they were 'worthy of offerings' (*āhuṇeyyā*).[66] He pointed out that parents do much for their children, bringing them up (*āpādakā*), taking care of them (*posakā*), and introducing them to the world (*lokassa dassetāro*).[67] "Moreover, whosoever incites his unbelieving parents, settles and establishes them in the faith; whosoever incites his immoral parents, settles and establishes them in morality; whosoever incites his stingy parents, settles and establishes them in liberality; whosoever

incites his foolish parents, settles and establish them in wisdom, such an one, just by so doing does repay, does more than repay what is due to his parents."[68]

On one occasion, *brahmin* millionaire is lament because of his son fulfilled none the duties have shown him the door. The Buddha advised him to recite the following verses in the Chapter Hall where his sons seated there also and his son would amend in their behavior.

They at whose birth my heart was glad,
For whose becoming much I longed,
They now in concert with their wives
Are as a dog that drives off swine.
Impious and shameless sooth are these
Who call me 'dear one,' call me 'dad'
Demons are they in guise of sons.
Him that is come to years they leave
Forsaken, as a worn-out horse
Unfed is led away from crib.
The sire, the senior of these boys
Doth beg his bread at others' doors
Better in sooth 'the stick' for me
Than having disobedient sons
It serves to keep off savage ox,
It serves to keep off savage hound-
Whereas I wandered in the dark
I find a footing in the deep,
And by the stick's effective power
I, though I stumbled, stand once more.[69]

In the *Saṁyutta Nikāya* it find conduct toward parent

stand foremost in the seven rules of conduct that a one can attain celestial sovereignty as the case of Sakka who ruler of the Thirty-three God. That is he would maintain his parents; he would revere the head of the family; he would use gentle language; he would utter no slander; with rid of stain and selfishness, he would conduct himself in the home with generosity, with clean hands, delighting in renunciation, amenable to petitions, delighting in sharing gifts; he would speak the truth; he would not give way to anger: if anger should rise, he would swiftly repress it.[70]

It is a similar relationship of respect in the performance of certain essential duties that is expected in Buddhist humanism between teachers and pupils. In five ways, a pupil should minister to a teacher by rising from the seat in salutation; by attending on him; by eagerness to learn; by personal service; by respectful attention while receiving instructions. In return, in five ways, teachers ministered to their pupils, show their compassion that they train them in the best discipline; they instruct them in the arts and sciences; they see that they grasp their lessons well; they introduce them to their friends and associates; they provide for their safety in every quarter.[71] In *Aṅguttara Nikāya,* it finds the Buddha's teaching for respectfulness to the teacher is one of seven ideas that prevent decline.[72]

The ideal recommended for the relationship between husbands and wives in Buddhist humanism in the sphere of sexual morality are the satisfaction of the sexual urge in a wholesome should not be degraded into a self-centered pursuit of pleasure seeking. In five ways, a husband should ministers to wife by being courteous to her; by not despising her; by being faithful to her; by handing over authority to her; by providing her with adornments. In return, the wife ministered to her husband shows her compassion to her husband in five ways that she performs her duties well; she

is hospitable to relations and attendants (the folk around); she is faithful; she protects what he brings; she is skilled and industrious in discharging her duties.[73] The relationship between husband and wife is necessary love and care, which grows naturally within the family unit. The family happiness is effect to the moral and psychological development of children. Buddhist humanism reasons parents to be worthy of respect. They are considered as *devas* in the children's eyes. Caring for one's old and disabled parents is an important virtue for the children. In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* the Buddha says that the wife who endowed with four qualities (viz. capable at her work, manage the servant, lovely to her husband, and guard his wealth) she wins power in this world and has this world in her grasp.[74] In other words, she is accomplished in confidence, virtue, charity and wisdom that penetrate into the rise and fall of things and complete in destruction of suffering. In other instruction the living together of husband and wife in good or bad conduct, the Buddha speaks that the blessing of a pleasant life is born; dejected are their foes, for both are good.[75] He also gives his advices to Sujātā, the daughter-in-law of Anāthapiṇḍika (famous Buddhist who offer *Jetavana* to the *saṅgha*) that she took notice of her parents-in-law or of her husband. He expounded 'seven kinds of wives', one like an executioner inflicting punishment (*vadhaka-*), one like a thief (*cora-*), one like a mistress (*ayya-*), one like a mother (*mātu-*), one like a sister (*bhaginī-*), one like a companion (*sakhi-*), and one like a slave (*dāsī-bhariyā*); and he also emphasized that the last four kinds of wises would, at death, wander in a heavenly world. Sujātā found herself in a responsible position and said that she would be the seventh kind.[76]

Relating to the selection of the friends and familiars, the Buddha teaches a household in five ways, a clansman should ministers to his friends and associates by liberality; by courteous speech; by being helpful; by being impartial;

by sincerity. In return, the friends and associates ministered to clansman show compassion to him in five ways that they protect him when he is heedless; they protect his property when he is heedless; they become a refuge when he is in danger; they do not forsake him in his troubles; they show consideration for his family.[77] It is said that a genuine friend is one who is a help and support, is the same in happiness and sorrow, who advices for one's welfare and who is sympathetic "*Saṅgāhako mittakaro, vadaññū vītamaccharo, netā vinetā anunetā, tādiso labhate yasaṃ.*"[78] Concerning the selection of one's friends the Buddha warns to his disciples two kinds of friends: one who is an evil friend, an evil comrade, an evil companion, serving, attending, honoring evil friends, emulating their ways of thought, cannot fulfill in the *Dhamma*-fore-course, in the *Dhamma*-training, in the virtues and he cannot give up lust passion, passion for material or for the immaterial; one who is good friend, comrade, companion, serving, attending, honoring good friends, emulating their ways of thought, will fulfill in the *Dhamma*-fore-course, in the *Dhamma*-training, in the virtues and he will give up lust passion, passion for form and for the formless.[79] In the other classification the Buddha says three kinds of friends: A person who is inferior to oneself in morality, concentration and one-pointedness of mind, and wisdom, should not be followed, served or honored except for reasons of compassion; A person who is one's equal in them should be followed since one's conversation with him would be on these subjects and so conducive to mutual profit and comfort; A person who is one's superior in them should be followed, served and honored with reverence since one would increase one's own virtue and understanding thereby.[80] In *Jātaka* it finds the Buddha's advices, with evil friend one should not be angry but merely avoid him,[81] while a wise enemy is better than a foolish friend.[82] *Dhammapada* cites, "Truly, he who moves in company with fools grieves

for a long time. Association with the foolish is ever painful as with a foe. Happy is association with the wise, even like meting with kinsfolk."[83] In the case of good companions where a mutual friendship is already established, loyalty to one's friends brings service and support, freedom from enemies, a welcome home after one's travels, and success in one's undertakings.[84] One should live up to one's promises[85] and should never separate friends.[86]

In relation to servants or employees the Buddha advises a master should minister to his servants and employees in five ways by assigning them work according to their ability; by supplying them with food and with wages; by tending them in sickness; by sharing with them any delicacies; by granting them leave at times. In return, the servants and employees thus ministered to their master show their compassion to him in five ways that they rise before him; they go to sleep after him; they take only what is given; they perform their duties well; they uphold his good name and fame.[87]

The Buddha teaches Sigāla there is in five ways, a householder should minister to ascetics and *brahmins* by lovable deeds; by lovable words; by lovable thoughts; by keeping open house to them; by supplying. In return, the ascetics and brahmins thus ministered to a householder show their compassion towards him in six ways that they restrain him from evil; they persuade him to do good; they love him with a kind heart; they make him hear what he has not heard; they clarify what he has already heard; they point out the path to a heavenly state.[88]

In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* it is recognized that for getting riches person's moral, high standard of duty regarding one's family is expected to be possessed of means by his work, diligence and justly obtained in a lawful way-he makes happy himself, his parents, wife and children, servant and

workfolk; he make happy his friends and companions; he would be able to keep his property from fire and water, rulers, robbers, enemies and heir; he would be able to make suitable offerings to his kin, guests, deceased, rulers, *devas;* he would be able to institute, over a period, offerings to recluses and others who abstain from pride and indolence, who bear all things in patience and humility, and who are engaged in every way in mastering, calming, and perfecting themselves.[89]

Regarding to the family happy, in the *Vyagghapajja Sutta,* the Buddha instructs rich householders how to preserve and increase their prosperity and how to avoid loss of wealth. Wealth alone, however, does not make a complete man or a harmonious society. Possession of wealth all too often multiplies man's desires, and he is ever in the pursuit of amassing more wealth and power. This unrestrained craving, however, leaves him dissatisfied and stifles his inner growth. It creates conflict and disharmony in society through the resentment of the underprivileged who feel them exploited by the effects of unrestrained craving. As Dīghajānu requests the Buddha: "Lord, we householders are immersed in the round of pleasure; we are cumbered with bed-mate and sons; we delight in the muslins from *Benares* and in the sandalwood; we deck ourselves with flowers, with garlands and cosmetics; we enjoy the use of both silver and gold. Lord, to such as us, let the Exalted One also teach *Dhamma*, teach the things which will be conducive to our advantage and happiness here on earth and to our advantage and happiness in the world to come."[90]

Regarding to this request for happiness in this life, the Buddha mentions to four achievements, viz. *utthana-sampada, arakkha-sampada, kalyanamittata,* and *sama-jivikata. Utthana-sampada* (the accomplishment of persistent effort) is whatsoever activity a householder earns his living, whether by farming, by trading, by rearing cattle, by archery, by

service under the king, or by any other kind of craft - at that he becomes skillful and is not lazy. He is endowed with the power of discernment as to the proper ways and means; he is able to carry out and allocate (duties). *Arakkha-sampada* (the accomplishment of watchfulness) is whatsoever wealth a householder is in possession of, obtained by dint of effort, collected by strength of arm, by the sweat of his brow, justly acquired by right means - such he husbands well by guarding and watching so that kings would not seize it, thieves would not steal it, fire would not burn it, water would not carry it away, nor ill-disposed heirs remove it. *Kalyanamittata* (good friendship) whatsoever village or market town a householder dwells, he associates, converses, engages in discussions with householders or householders' sons, whether young and highly cultured or old and highly cultured, full of faith (*saddha*), full of virtue (*sila*), full of charity (*caga*), full of wisdom (*paññña*). He acts in accordance with the faith of the faithful, with the virtue of the virtuous, with the charity of the charitable, with the wisdom of the wise. Sama-jivikata (balanced livelihood) a householder knowing his income and expenses leads a balanced life, neither extravagant nor miserly, knowing that thus his income will stand in excess of his expenses, but not his expenses in excess of his income. Just as the goldsmith or an apprentice of his, knows, on holding up a balance, that by so much it has dipped down, by so much it has tilted up; even so a householder, knowing his income and expenses leads a balanced life, neither extravagant nor miserly, knowing that thus his income will stand in excess of his expenses, but not his expenses in excess of his income. If a householder with little income were to lead an extravagant life, there would be those who say this person enjoys his property like one who eats wood-apple. If, a householder with a large income were to lead a wretched life, there would be those who say this person will die like a starveling.

In the spiritual aspect of a person's life, the Buddha also mentions to four conditions conducive to a householder's weal and happiness as *saddha-sampadā, sila-sampadā, caga-sampadā, and paññña-sampadā. Saddhā-sampadā* (faith) should possess in a householder's mind that he believes in the Enlightenment of the Perfect One (*Tathagata*), who is the pure one, fully enlightened, endowed with knowledge and conduct, well-gone, the knower of worlds, the incomparable leader of men to be tamed, the teacher of gods and men, all-knowing and blessed. *Sīla-sampadā* (virtue) is the cultivation of good practices of a householder abstains from killing, stealing, sexual misconduct, lying, and from intoxicants that cause infatuation and heedlessness. *Cāga-sampadā* (charitable action) involves living with a mind freed from the stain of avarice and a person's readiness to share one's earnings with others by charity, open-handed, delighting in generosity. *Paññā-sampadā* (wisdom) concerns to a householder as the necessary for living wisely, cultivating detachment, reflecting the transient and fluxional nature of everything that leads to the destruction of suffering.[91]

The Buddha speaks of four kinds of happiness that a layperson, who enjoys the pleasures of sense from time to time, can attain *atthi-sukha* (the happiness of possessing abundant wealth), *bhoga-sukha* (the happiness of enjoying one's wealth making oneself, one's family, and one's friends and relatives happy, *anana-sukha* (the happiness of not being in debt and *anavajja-sukha* (the happiness of living a righteous life.[92] And, there are four sources for the increase of amassed wealth, namely, abstinence from looseness with women, abstinence from debauchery in drinking, abstinence from knavery in dice-play, and having friendship, companionship and intimacy with the good. Just as in the case of a great reservoir, with only four inlets and only four outlets, if a person were to open the inlets and close the outlets, and if there should be a proper fall of rain, an increase in water is

certainly to be expected in that great reservoir and not a decrease, even so these four conditions are the sources of increase of amassed wealth.[93]

Buddhist humanism believes that immorality of the rulers can ultimately affect even the regularities of nature.[94] The Buddha proclaims the ten virtues of ruler-ship (*dasarājadhamma*) viz. *dāna* (giving), *sīla* (moral practice), *pariccāga* (liberality), *ajāva* (strainghtness), *maddava* (gentleness), *tapa* (restraint), *akkodha* (non-anger), *avihimsā* (non-injury), *khanti* (forbearance) and *avirodhanā* (non-opposition). Although the widely prevalent political order of the Buddha's time was monarchical in structure, Buddhist humanism attempted to show that to serve the interests of the people it was necessitated ruler who conquers territory not by the might of arms but by means of moral principles (*adaṇḍenaasatthena dhammena abhivijiya*), by principles of justice (*dhamma*).

Mahā-Mangala Sutta, cherished highly in all lands of Buddhist humanism, is a terse but comprehensive summary of the teaching's ethics to individual and social. The greatest blessings enumerated in it, are an unfailing guide on life's journey. Rightly starting with 'avoidance of bad company', which is basic to all moral and spiritual progress, the Blessings culminate in the achievement of a passion-free mind, unshakable in its serenity. To follow the ideals set forth in these verses is the sure way to harmony and progress for the individual as well as for society, nation and mankind.[95]

The Exalted One mentioned the greatest blessings as following:

a. Not to associate with the foolish, but to associate with the wise; and to honor those who are worthy of honor.

b. To reside in a suitable locality to have done meritorious actions in the past and to set oneself in the right course.

c. To have much learning, to be skillful in handicraft, well trained in discipline, and to be of good speech.

d. To support mother and father, to cherish wife and children, and to be engaged in peaceful occupation.

e. To be generous in giving, to be righteous in conduct to help one's relatives, and to be blameless in action.

f. To loathe more evil and abstain from it, to refrain from intoxicants and to be steadfast in virtue.

g. To be respectful, humble, contented and grateful; and to listen to the Dhamma on due occasions.

h. To be patient and obedient, to associate with monks and to have religious discussions on due occasions.

i. Self-restraint, a holy and chaste life, the perception of the Noble Truths and the realization of *Nibbāna*.

j. A mind unruffled by the vagaries of fortune from sorrow freed, from defilements cleansed, from fear liberated.

Those who thus abide, ever remain invincible, in happiness established. These are the greatest blessings.

To contrary, in *Parabhava Sutta*,[96] the Exalted One warns to his disciple when he pointed out the causes of one's downfall:

a. He who is averse to loves *Dhamma* progresses.

b. The wicked are dear to him, with the virtuous he finds no delight, he prefers the creed of the wicked.

c. Being fond of sleep, fond of company, indolent, lazy and irritable.

d. Though being well to do, not to support father and mother who are old and past their youth.

e. To deceive by falsehood a Brahmin or Ascetic or any other mendicant.

f. To have much wealth and ample gold and food, but to enjoy one's luxuries alone.

g. To be proud of birth, of wealth or clan, and to despise one's own kinsmen.

h. To be a rake, a drunkard, a gambler, and to squander all one earns.

i. Not to be contented with one's own wife, and to be seen with harlots and the wives of others.

j. Being past one's youth, to take a young wife and to be unable to sleep for jealousy of her.

k. To place in authority a woman given to drink and squandering, or a man of a like behavior.

l. To be of noble birth, with vast ambition and of slender means, and to crave for ruler ship.

In the *Sangīti Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha said the five advantages to the moral man through his success in virtuous conduct. In first place, he acquires through industry great wealth. Secondly, good reports of him spread abroad. Thirdly, whatever assembly he attends, whether of nobles, *brahmins*, householder, or members of a religious order, he enters confident and undisturbed. Fourthly, he dies with lucid and assure mind. Fifthly, he is reborn to a happy destiny in a bright world.[97]

THE EFFICACY OF ETHICS

Training of Mind

Buddhist humanism is required to fulfill can be seen as an attempt to eliminate unwholesome dispositions (*akusala dhamma*) and to cultivate unwholesome dispositions (*kusala dhamma*). It emphasizes not only abstention from certain activities that are prompted by evil dispositions but also the cultivation of positive acts, which strengthen the wholesome

dispositions. In other words, the cankers must be uprooting as the necessity free of mind. In the *Sabbāsava Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, the Buddha describes in detail the seven methods that canker of sense-pleasure, canker of becoming and canker of ignorance have not arisen do not arise, and have arisen decline. The cankers (*āsava*) are to be got rid of by vision (*dassana*), by control (*saṃvara*), by use (*paṭisevanā*), by endurance (*adhivāsanā*), by avoidance (*parivajjanā*), by elimination (*vinodanā*), by mental development (*bhāvanā*).[98]

The destruction of the canker (*āsava*) is not at all possible by merely wishing which one has to control himself in the way of practice keeping himself away from immoral deeds and cultivating moral deeds. In the *Dhammapada*, the Buddha advises that one should always watch to the body's deed, who do not follow what ought not to be done, and who steadfastly do what ought to be done, such watchful and wise, cankers come to an end.[99] He, furthermore, instructs one should practices to restrain from finding faults with other and to keep himself free from irritation that the cankers will increase.[100] Or "Those who are ever watchful, who study day and night, and who strive after *Nibbāna*, their cankers will come to an end."[101] Or the Buddha says, "Out of these four castes, whoever is a monk, who is an arahant, who has eradicated the canker, is fully trained and accomplished, who has laid down the burden, is freed through right knowledge; he amongst them is reckoned as the highest in terms of righteous ness and not in terms of unrighteousness."[102] Defilements of the mind (*kilesa*) are suggested in the *Cullaniddesa*, four essentials of perfection to limit viz. the recognition of evil, the removal of its source (which is *kilesa*), the meditation on the Path, and the realization of the extinction of evil.[103] *Kilesa* in this connection interchanges with *samudaya*, as denoting the origin of evil.[104]

The Buddha asserts a person possesses ten qualities viz. perfect of eight factors of the Noble Eightfold Path in addition

to right knowledge (*sammāñāṇa*) and right release (*sammāvimutti*),[105] is called one who is endowed with *kusala*.[106] The practices that are *kusala* gradually lead a person to the highest state of *Nibbāna*. So, the *kusala* are also sometimes enumerated as the four bases of mindfulness (*cattāro-satipatthānā*), the four modes of right endeavor (*cattāro-sammappadhāna*), the four bases of psychic power (*cattāro-iddhipādā*), the five faculties (*pañcindriyāni*), the five powers (*pañcabalāni*), the seven factors of enlightenment (*sattābojjhanga*) and the Eightfold Path (*ariyo atthangiko maggo*).[107] In the same context it is said that the highest *kusala* state is the final freedom of mind and freedom thought wisdom, which one attains, by the elimination of all mental impurities. "One has reached the end of his journey, he trembles not, his cravings are gone, he is free from sin, he has burnt the thorns of life this is his last mortal body." "He is free from lust, he is free from greed, he knows the meaning of words, and the meaning of their combinations. He is a great man; a great man who sees the light this is his last mortal body."[108]

In the *Pāsādika Sutta* the venerable Ānanda states the nine things, which have been perfectly set forth by the Buddha that the mental intoxicants are destroyed, who has lived the life, who has done his task, who has laid low his burden, who has attained salvation, who has utterly destroyed the fetter of rebirth, who is emancipated by the true gnosis:

a. He is incapable of deliberately depriving a living creature of life.
b. He is incapable of taking what is not given so that it constitutes theft.
c. He is incapable of sexual impurity.
d. He is incapable of deliberately telling lies.

e. He is incapable of laying up treasure for indulgence in worldly pleasure as he used to do in the life of the house.

f. He is incapable of taking a wrong course through partiality.

g. He is incapable of taking a wrong course through hate.

h. He is incapable of taking a wrong course through stupidity.

i. He is incapable of taking a wrong course through fear.[109]

Āsavas are so deep-rooted and so intermingled with the process of life that they are not easily identified and uproot at a time. It consists of ten *saṃyojanas* (fetters) which divided into two parts: Five fetters as to lower worlds, to wit, error of permanent individual entity (*sakkāyadiṭṭhi*), doubts (*vicikicchā*), wrong judgment as to rules and ritual (*silabbata-parāmāṣa*), sensuality (*kamārāga*), malevolence (*paṭigha*); Five fetters as to upper worlds, to wit, lust after rebirth in form-worlds (*rūparāga*), lust after rebirth in formless-worlds (*arūparāga*), conceit (*māna*), excitement (*uddhacca*), ignorance (*avijjā*).[110] For the destruction of *āsavas*,[111] one requires to culture enough devotion and sincerely. *Āsavas* (cankers) are destroyed at third stages in four stages to attain of enlightenment. First stage of enlightenment attains stream-sainthood (*sotāpati*), which is the destruction of three fetters, namely, *sakkāyadiṭṭhi* (error of permanent individual entity), *vicikicchā* (doubts), *silabbata-parāmāṣa* (wrong judgment as to rules and ritual). With the destruction of *sakkāyadiṭṭhi*, the four-*akusala cittas* rooted in *lobha* and *moha cetasikas* connected with *diṭṭhiāsavas* and *akusala cittas* connected with doubt is simultaneously destroyed. Second stage to attain of enlightenment becomes once-returner (*sakadāgāmi*), the potentiality of the *akusala cittas* as passion, hate and illusion

are diminished. It also conducts to attenuate the two fetters, namely, *kamārāga* (sensuality) and *vicikicchā* (doubts). Therefore, canker of sense-pleasure (*kāmāsava*) also is weakened. Third stage to attain of enlightenment becomes never-returner (*anāgāmi*). This stage is the complete eradication of two fetters, namely, *kamārāga* (sensuality), *paṭigha* (malevolence). *Akusala cittas* and canker of *kāmāsava* also eradicates completely. Fourth stage of enlightenment attains sainthood (*arahatta*). The twelve-*akusala cittas* of *moha* (ill-will) and *avijjā* (ignorance) does not rise. By the attainment of *paññā* (wisdom), the five last fetters, namely, *rūparāga* (lust after rebirth in form-worlds), *arūparāga* (lust after rebirth in formless-worlds), *māna* (conceit), *uddhacca* (excitement) and *avijjā* (ignorance) is destroyed completely. By destroying of *rūparāga* and *arūparāga*, they conduct to demolish of canker of becoming (*bhavāsava*). By destroying of ignorance (*avijjā*), it carries out to destroy of canker of ignorance (*avijjāsara*). The complete destruction of the mental intoxicants has come to know and realize even in this life, emancipation of intellect and emancipation of insight, and therein abides. In *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, ven. Ānanda said when the cankers are destroyed it has five condition of best, namely, while one looks that is the best of sights, while one listens that is the best of sounds, while one rejoices that is the best of joys, while one is conscious that is the best of conscious states, while one has become that is the best of becomings.[112] In the *Vatthūpama Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha states that if man should wish: 'By the destruction of the cankers, having realized by my own super-knowledge here and now the freedom of mind,[113] and freedom through wisdom[114] that are canker-less entering thereon, may I abide therein,' he should be one who fulfils the moral habits, who is intent on mental tranquility within, who does not interrupt (his) meditation, who is endowed with vision, a cultivator of empty place."[115]

The attainment of Insight

The insight is called right knowledge (*sammāñāna*), is the knowledge into things as they have come to be (*yathābhūtañānadassana*) in their true nature. Seeing things is not merely in they appear, but in the way they really, i.e. understand them as being impermanent (*anicca*), unsatisfactory (*dukkha*) and non-substantial (*anattā*). However, ignorance clouds one's sight and it is said as key cause that binds man to the conditioned existence of *saṃsāra*.

Buddhist humanism always emphasizes the importance of the spiritual journey to wards inner purity of man. In other words, that is a journey, which attach to the development of insight. It is said the whole body of *Pāli Nikāya* deals with 'insight' as the key of emancipation. The factors constituting the path leading to the attainment of insight is clearly stated the moral culture (*sīla*), concentration (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*paññā*).[116] In that process moral culture (*sīla*) occupies an important position such as the *Mahāvedalla Sutta* regards to moral culture or education (*sīla*) is one of the five conditions necessary.[117] The *Gaṇaka-Moggallāna Sutta*[118] gives a still further account elaborating ethical aspects and the path to attainment of insight. In *Milinda-pañha sīla* function is one of seven *ratanas: sīla* (moral conduct), *samādhi* (concentration), *paññā* (wisdom), *vimutti* (emancipation), *vimuttiñaṇadassana* (the sight of knowledge), *paṭīsambhidā* (path to attainment) and *bojjhanga* (condition of welfare).[119] The perfection of *sīla* is recognized as the foundation or the basis of spiritual endeavors. An intelligent man is supposed to establish himself in discipline (*sīla*) and develop his mind (*citta*) and cultivate wisdom (*paññā*). It is such a person who is said to be able to disentangle the tangles of evil.[120] If the entire spiritual training Buddhist humanism is understood as an attempt to transform the moral nature of man, *sīla* can be considered as the beginning of this conscious and deliberate

process of self-transformation. Besides the foremost place of *sīla* in the threefold scheme of training, it occupies a prominent place among other list of spiritual qualities recommended in Buddhist humanism.

The ethical perfection of Buddhist humanism is the form of mind's training, which a person could be vigilant about his overt behavior through abstention and conscious self-control, and the practice of the opposite type of actions, so that transformation occurs at the grossest and most tangible level of one's personality. The goodness of the actions of enlightened persons is believed to follow spontaneously from the inner transformation that occurs in the culmination of the spiritual path. Such persons do not fact the moral struggle that the unenlightenment have to face due to the conflict between what is known to be the right thing to do and the inclination to do the wrong thing.

The progressive path of *sīla* (moral conduct), *samādhi* (concentration), *paññā* (wisdom) is intended to be a systematic way of tackling the problem of moral evil with deep psychological insight. Immorality in overt human behavior is, according to Buddhist humanism, only manifestation at the surface level, of man's deep-rooted evil dispositions. Buddhist humanism speaks of the existence and activity of moral evil at three different levels. At the most deep-rooted level they are dormant or dispositional traits (*anusaya*). Even a person who does not exhibit violent behavior at a particular moment in his life has the tendency to do so when he meets with a certain situation. This is because he has not overcome the disposition to behave in evil ways. The second level at which moral evil function is the one at which there is a mere excitement of feeling and emotion. One often feels the turbulence, discomfort and heat of anger and passion without letting such feeling boil over in the form of observable overt behavior. Buddhist humanism refers to this psychological level as (*pariyuṭṭhāna*).

It is at the third level that evil is manifested in the form of overt action through word and deep leading to the transgression of the moral norms of society (*vitikama*). It is at this level that human action has a great deal of social significance. The function of *sīla* (moral conduct) is to deal with immorality at the progress level at which it manifests itself. Immorality becomes more tangible at this level than at concealed levels of the mind. Hence Buddhist humanism advises a person to make *sīla* (moral conduct) the starting point of moral progress. One is not expected to more from one stage of the path to the other only after attaining absolute perfection in each preceding stage. They are to be cultivated conçurrently. The canonical teaching maintains that the fruitfulness of each succeeding stage depends on the degree of perfection attained in each preceding stage. Mental composure, which attains growth through wholesome practice *sīla* (moral conduct) and *paññā* (wisdom) that attains growth through mental composure are said to be very fruitful.

The *samādhi* (concentration) is to deal directly with evil at the more subtle level of the human mind. In concentration (*samādhi*) there is an attempt to bring about one pointedness and composure of the mind to prevent the excitement of the unwholesome emotions. Here, one takes full conscious control of one's mental activity and fixes the mind through voluntary effort on a single object determined at one's will. By means of *samādhi* (concentration) certain unwholesome emotions are eliminated from the mind, at least temporality, and certain wholesome emotions such as compassion, mindfulness and equanimity are cultivated.

Paññā (wisdom) is believed to deal with moral evil at the very source. *Paññā* (wisdom) is the understanding that eradicates all evil tendencies in such away that they are not born again. It is emancipating-knowledge that one can confidently declare, 'what ought to be done has been done,

and the goal of the higher life has been accomplished.' At this stage occurs, what in Buddhist terms is called the eradication of *āsava* (*āsavakkhaya*). The *āsava* persist as long as there is ignorance about the nature of things. The Buddha says that the *āsava* are conditioned by ignorance (*avijjā samudayā āsava samudayo*). It can be compared with the Socratic view that immorality is due to lack of knowledge. However, the knowledge required in Buddhist humanism is not of abstract forms to be apprehended by the intellect as suggested by Plato, but knowledge of the conditioned nature of all empirical phenomena. The practice of *sīla* (moral conduct) is preparatory stage for the attainment of the final emancipating knowledge. The kind of conduct mentioned under *sīla* (moral conduct) does not require any voluntary effort after the final emancipating knowledge has been attained. Buddhist humanism speaks of the person who is in the process of fulfilling the requirements of the path as a trainee (*sekha*) and one who has fulfilled all the requirements a person who needs no further moral training as an *asekha*. *Vimutti* (emancipation) is the result in the process of training excellent self-restraint as to the senses, endowed with this so excellent mindfulness and self-possession, filled with this so excellent content. It is emancipation from the five hindrances – covetousness, ill temper, laziness, worry, and perplexity. Hindrances are not put away within him looks upon himself as debt, diseased, in prison, in slavery, lost on a desert road. But when these five hindrances have been put away within him, he looks upon himself as freed from debt, rid of diseased, out of jail, a free man, secure.[121] *Vimuttiñaṇadassana* (the sight of knowledge) is arising from knowledge when his heart made pure, cultured, devoid of evil, supple, ready to act, firm, and imperturbable. The five modes of special intuition (*abhiññā*) take place – the practice of mystic wonders (*iddhi*), hearing heavenly sounds, knowledge of other people's thoughts, knowledge of one's

own previous births, and knowledge of other people's previous births.[122] In his 'The Ethics of Buddhism', Tachibana also says that the trained mind is called *vimutta citta,* which it leads to emancipate from all evil objects.[123] *Paṭisambhidā-magga* (path to attainment)[124] it finds five groups as *pānātipatassa pahānaṃ, veramanī, cetanā, saṃvara* and *avītikkama. Pānātipatassa pahānaṃ* (rejection or abandoning) makes the right resolve for abandoning immorality for morality, faithlessness for faith and selfishness for generosity. Righteous conduct is the observance of the ten good actions (*kusala-kammapatha*) in thought, word and deed: freeing the mind of greed, ill-will and wrong views; avoiding speech that is untruthful, slanderous, abusive and frivolous; and the non- committal acts of killing, stealing and sexual misconduct. Good speech that is opportune, truthful, friendly, profitable and spoken with thoughts of loving-kindness. *Veramanī* (abstinence) is the basis of the morality and exists in the deliberate abstention from wrong speech, wrong bodily action, and wrong livelihood. The abstention is not only occurrence of these evil things, but also a mental disposition of detachment preventing the evil from arising. *Cetanā* (active intention) regards to the self-centered or result-oriented which impels the worldly individual (*puthujjana*). This *cetanā* is altogether absent in the liberated individual (*ariya*) who is free from the obsession 'this is mine' (*etam mama*), 'this am I' (*eso 'ham asmi*) and 'this is my self' (*eso me attā*). The conduct and behavior of the individual thus obsessed expressing themselves through thought, word and deed, is action (kamma), which is evaluated as wholesome (*kusala*) and unwholesome (*akusala*).[125] *Saṃvara* (restraint) consists of virtue (*sīla-*), mindfulness (*sati-*), insight (*ñāṇa-*), patience (*khanti-*), and effort (*viriya-saṃvara*).[126] *Avītikkama* (non-transgression) is the condition preventing sins, which damage man's conduct. *Bojjhangas'* s quality at several places in the *Dīgha Nikāya,* which contribute to the great happiness

of gods and man, viz. four *satipaṭṭhānā* (earnest meditations), four *sammapadhānā* (great struggle against evil), four *iddhipādā* (roads to saint-ship), five *indriyāni* (kinds of wisdom), five *balāni* (moral powers), seven *bojjhangas* (organs of spiritual sense) and *aṭṭhangika magga* (eightfold path).[127] The seven *bojjhanga* (condition of welfare) are *sati* (mindfulness), *Dhamma-vicaya* (invest-igation of the Law), *viriya* (energy), *pīti* (rapture), *passaddhi* (repose), *samādhi* (concentration), *upekhā* (equanimity).[128]

Throughout the *Pāli Nikāya* the virtue is taught in many different ways viz. *'indriyesu guttadvāratā'* (guarding the doors of the sense organs), *'rakkhitamānasāno'* (protecting one's own mind), *'vijitindriyo'* (a man who has conquered his senses), *'danto santo niyato'*[129] (one whose mind is controlled, calmed and restrained), *'bhāvitam cittam'* (a mind which is trained), *'samvuto pātimokkhasmim'* (a man who has restrained himself by means of the rules of monks). Many other words of similar derivation and significance are used to express the virtue of self-restraint. The 'self-restraint' or 'self-control' holds an important position among the virtues of Buddhist humanism. This virtue is trained to limit evils may come into human mind. In the *Sekha Sutta*, it finds similar advice with *Gaṇaka-Moggallāna Sutta* "Come you be of moral habit, live controlled by the control of the obligations, endowed with (right) behavior and pasture, seeing peril in the slightest faults and, undertaking them, train yourself in the rules of training."[130] Or one should live perfect in the performance of the obligations, restrained with the restraint of the obligations, perfect in the practice of right behavior; seeing danger in the slightest faults, undertake and train in the training of the precepts.[131] To depend on the measure of trained, controlled and cultured the Buddhist humanism divides into two classes, viz. well trained and purified one to distinguish from untrained one.

If men were not restrained by means of moral teachings

or culture, the result will be moral degeneration and the destruction of social order. The senses must, therefore, be controlled and led aright through the power of reason and the effort of will, which in their turn, must be properly trained. There are evil unskilled states of mind may flow in that one should be guarded as to the doors of the sense organs,[132] the moderate in eating,[133] intent on vigilance,[134] intent on mindfulness and clear consciousness. One is shamed and fears blame for wrong conduct on body (*kāya-duccarita*), speech (*vacī-duccarita*), and thought (*mano-duccarita*) when he falls into evil unskilled mental states. In moral culture, the restraint of the sense organs is very important. The Buddha praises a monk who is not affected by external objects, which he sees or hears. The things, which come into contact with our senses, must be subdued and tranquillized. When the senses are totally and perfectly controlled, the Buddhist culture may be said to be perfected.

Evils always try to invade the mind through mental, vocal and bodily forms of actions are regarded as the doors of the six sense organs. One should shut doors of sense organs and also the doors of action. One should, therefore, keep close watch on them and prevent evils from entering the mind. One who restrains himself in three places, i.e., commits no evil action in body, speech or mind, is said to be true *Brāhmaṇa*. To proceed from the initial sage one has to bring about simultaneously mental and moral culture, and gradually exclude the mind of defilements, which constitute emotional factors as well as mental and physical lassitude that prevent the mind from truthful sight.[135] If man allows no evils to come in through the 'doors' of six sense organs, and to go out through the three 'doors' of action, there will be no evils at all.[136]

Mind is the most important object of restraint. If the mind is restrained well, the five other sense organs will be

restrained. This is why so much stress is laid upon the restraint of mind. It must be trained, tamed, protected, guarded, restrained and subjugated. It must be calmed, tranquillized and brought to a fixed state. A person of self-control never loses his consciousness in whatever situation he may be. Buddha says: "Therefore, O Monks, you ought to train yourself as follows: My inner mind will be fixed, perfectly fixed and no sinful, evil objects, which arise, will take hold of it."[137] *Aṅguttara Nikāya* shows the defilements that have to be got rid of by one who is engaged in developing the higher mind (*adhicitta*) are said to be threefold, as gross (*olārika*), medium (*majjhimaka*) and subtle (*sukhuma*).[138]

The gross defilements consist of misconduct with regard to body, speech and thought; the medium are sensuous thoughts (*kāma-vitakka*), thoughts of ill-will (*vyāpada-vitakka*), and thoughts or cruelty (*vihiṁsā-vitakka*) and the subtle consist of attachment to one's race (*jāti*), country (*janapada*) and egotism, superciliousness or arrogance (*avaññatti*). When these are got rid of righteous (*dhamma-vitakka*) only remain, and the mind becomes fixed within (*citaṃ ajjhattaṃ santiṭṭhati*). The *Cūlasaccaka Sutta* says that a monk wish his mind freed thus, becomes possessed of three superior attainments things which are not excelled by anything else: insight which is not excelled by anything else (*dassanānuttariya*); of the path (*paṭipadānuttariya*) and freedom (*vimuttānuttariya*).[139] In the *Sangīti Sutta,* the venerable Sāriputta shows the *Dhammas* have been perfectly set forth by the Buddha that one should be chanting in the concord, not a wrangling that may be welfare and happiness of many fold as " rectitude and shamefacedness; patience and gentleness; mildness of speech and courtesy; mindfulness and intelligence; the powers of judging and of cultivation; the powers of mindfulness and concentration; calm and insight; mental grasp and balance; attainment in conduct and in (sound) belief; purity in conduct and in belief; the higher

wisdom and emancipation; knowledge how to extirpate and knowledge how to prevent recrudescence."[140]

Heedfulness (*appamāda*), initiative (*parakkama*), firmness (*thāma*) and will or determination (*aditthāna*) are considered to be no less, important in the moral life of a person. The virtues as gratitude (*kataññutā*), frugality (*appichatā*), contentment (*santuṭṭhi*), meekness (*sorata, nivāta, sovacassatā*), learning or listening to moral teachings (*dhammasavana, bāhusacca*), association with persons having moral knowledge and insight (*paṇḍtānaṃ sevanā*), discussion of the good Dhamma with persons having moral knowledgeable persons (*dhammasākacchā*), conduce to the elimination of egotistic inclination and greed disposition is also considered. In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, how to live perfect in virtue, in the performance of the obligations the Buddha teaches:

"Whether he walks or stands or sits or lies
Or stretch his limbs or draw them in again,
Let him do all these things composedly.
Above, across, and back again returning
Whatever be one's bourn in all the world
Let him be one who view the rise and fall
Of all compounded things attentively.
For mind's composure doing what is right,
Ever and always training, 'ever intent'
That is the name men give to such a monk."[141]

In the *Saṁyutta Nikāya*, Nandana, the son of the *devas* (deity), asking with question what kind of man is it that they call virtuous, possesses wisdom, beyond all sorrow that *devas* (deity) worship. The Exacted One says he that is wise, virtuous, cultivated in mind, intent, given to *Jhāna*, mindful. All miseries driven away and banished: he is known as the dug-destroyer.[142]

The training of virtue and cultivation of mind are also recognized in the story ploughing. To doubt the Buddha's ploughed and sow, farmer Bhāradvāja addressed him in a verse: -

"A ploughman by thine own confession thou?
No ploughing can I see!
The 'ploughman' queried, tell me how to know
The ploughing done by thee."
In answer to farmer the Exacted One says: -
"Faith is the seed, and rain the discipline.
Insight for me is plough fitted with yoke,
My pole is conscience and sense-mind the tie,
And mindfulness my ploughshare and my goal,
Guarded in action, guarded too in speech,
And temperate as to my stomach's food,
I weed with truth, and my release from work
Is that fair thing of innermost desire.
Energy is my burden-bearing team,
Drawing my plough toward the haven sure.
Onward it goes nor ever turneth back;
And where it goeth we shall weep no more.
Such is the ploughing that is ploughed by me.
The fruit it bears is food ambrosial.
Whoso this ploughing hath accomplished, he
From suffering and from sorrow is set free."[143]

It is clearly the Buddha's ploughing is not only enjoying of present, but also looking for fruit ambrosial, for minds discerning. With that wisdom's ploughing he made perfect purged from all mental poisons and attaining calm as well as peace from all fret and worry.

It is also found in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya,* the Buddha's teaching through three forms of higher training that dealing with the higher morality, higher thought and higher insight. In the training of higher morality, a person lives moral and restrained with the restraint of obligations he takes up and trains himself in the laws of morality. In the training of higher thought a person remote from sensual desire (practices the four musings) attaining the fourth musing he abides therein. In the training of higher insight a person understands, as it really is, the meaning of 'this is ill; this is the arising of ill; this is the ending of ill; this is the practice leading to the ending of ill.[144]

In brief, it is clearly to say that ethical conduct of Buddhist humanism is not rule of behaviors to limit the man's capacity, but it is means to train expelling the canker (*āsavas*) of mind and man can attain to highest happiness through on the vast conception of universal love and compassion for all living beings on which based the whole nature of man. It is not only all human values in experiences and relationships, but also the omnipotent key open the doors of insight for man's understanding what the things are.

In other words, a comprehensive system of ethics in Buddhist humanism embraces into the process sublime psychology. A system of pure thoughts a lofty philosophy and moral teachings lead to enlightenment and liberation from all sufferings. Spiritual progress of purification is prerequisite condition for man's life. Human happiness, whether at the individual level or the societal level depends on the inner purity and moral development of the individuals constituting a society.[145] Or "The man skilled in the path is a designation for a Perfect One accomplished and fully enlightened."[146] Further, the ethics of Buddhist humanism describes as the ultimate goal for the attainment of *Nibbāna* as a kind of moral perfection.

References

1. *Odhams Dictionary of the English Language Illustrated*, Odhams Ltd, 1946; H. John Muirhead, '*The Elements of Ethics*', London, 1910, p. 4; S. John Mackenzie, '*Amanual of Ethics*', London (1929), p. 1; H. Saddhatissa, '*Buddhist Ethics: Essence of Buddhism*', London (1970), p. 15.
2. G. E. Moore, '*Principia Ethica*', Cambridge University Press, Reprint 1954, p. 2.
3. Jayatilake K.N., '*Dhamma, Man and Law*', Singapore: The Buddhist Research Society, p. 45.
4. D. III, p. 84.
5. See S.B.B., Vol. II, p. 234.
6. Dhp. v. 183; See D. II, p. 49.
7. S. I, p. 14, 164.
8. Vism. pp. 5-6.
9. Tachiabana S., '*Ethics of Buddhism*', Colombo (1943), pp. 37-38.
10. A. I, p. 173 f.
11. D. I, p. 55; M.I, p. 515; J. VI, p. 225 f.
12. D. I, p. 53; A.I, p. 33 f.; M. I, p. 516.
13. E.O.R.E. Ed. by Hastings, James, Vol. X, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1967, p. 778.
14. S. V, p. 268.
15. D. II, p. 100; III, p. 58; S. III, p. 42; V, p. 163.
16. A. IV, p. 125 f.
17. D. I, p. 244 ff.
18. A. V, p. 292.
19. S. I, p. 227.
20. A. I, pp. 248-249.
21. M. III, p. 202 f.
22. A. II, p. 74, 186.
23. A. V, p. 288 ff.
24. F. Max Muller (Ed.), '*The Sacred Books of the East*', Vol. X, part II. Reprinted by Motilal Banarasidass (1988), p. 23.
25. Dhammaratana, U., '*Buddha and Caste System*', Balprapur: Bes (1969), p. 33.
26. A. V, p. 91.
27. D. I, p. 99.
28. D. III, p. 80 ff.
29. Dhp. vv. 1-2.

30. M. I, p. 415.
31. A. I, p. 189.
32. M. II, p. 114.
33. A. V, p. 240 ff., 273 ff.
34. Ud. p. 66.
35. M. II, p. 116.
36. M. I, p. 489; see Vibhaṅga, p.515.
37. D. II, pp. 84-89; Dhs. p. 1096. In the *Itivuttaka* it is mentioned three cankers, namely, lust (*kāma*), becoming (*bhava*) and ignorance (*avijjā*), Iti. pp. 49-50.
38. D. III, p. 182; Dhs. *Atthakathā*, p. 48.
39. *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha-vibhāvaniṭīkā*, I, Ch. VII. 3, p.187.
40. *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, Ch. VIII. 3, p.187.
41. Dhs. p. 1229; Vism. p. 683; See Ps. I, p. 130.
42. Nd. II. s.v. *Rāga*; cp. Dhs. part. 982, 1006.
43. S. II, p. 167. See D. III, p. 234.
44. DA. I, p. 88.
45. A. II, p. 228.
46. D. III, p. 182 f.
47. D. I, p. 146.
48. Victor A. Gunasekara, '*A Comparison of the Doctrines of Humanism and Buddhism considering their Similarities and Differences*', see http://www.google.com, s.v. *Humanism*.
49. A. IV, p.248 sq with a poetical setting of the eight at A. IV, p.254; Sn. vv. 400, 401.
50. A. I, p. 269 (where called *sīla-sampadā*); II, p. 83 sq
51. D. I, p. 9 ff.
52. A. I, p. 211; Kh. I, p.1.
53. D. I, pp. 5-18.
54. D. I, p. 206 sq. At A. V, pp. 205-206 *sīla-kkhandha* refers to the *culla-sīla* only.
55. Dhp. vv. 360-361.
56. Prof. Kewal Krishan Mital, '*Perspectives on Buddhist Ethics: Buddhist Ethics-A Brief Appraisal*', Delhi University (1989), p. 3.
57. D. I, pp. 47-86.
58. Dhp. v. 354.
59. Referring to the fourfold purity in moral habit. See MA. II, p. 155
60. See D. III, p. 214; A. I, p. 95. Sīla- and diṭṭhi-visuddhi
61. Cf. Ud. p. 60.
62. See MA. II, p. 115.

63. M. I, p. 177; all these seven stages of purification are also found at D.III, p. 288 with two added: purity through wisdom, purity through freedom. See Dial. III, p. 262, fn.3.
64. J. I, p. 73; DhpA. I, p. 84.
65. D. III, p. 189.
66. A. I, p. 132; Iti. 109 f.
67. A. I, p. 61,132; Iti. 109 f.
68. A. I, p. 61.
69. S. I, p. 175-177
70. S. I, p. 228.
71. D. III, p. 189.
72. Cf. A. IV, pp. 27-31.
73. D. III, p. 190.
74. A. III, pp. 269-270.
75. A. II, pp. 57-59.
76. A. IV, pp. 91-93.
77. D. III, p. 190.
78. D. III, p. 187.
79. A. III, pp. 421-422.
80. A. III
81. J. III, p. 27.
82. J. I, p. 247.
83. Dhp. v. 207
84. J. IV, p. 22.
85. J. III, p. 253.
86. J. III, p. 192.
87. D. III, p. 191.
88. D. III, p. 192.
89. A. III, p. 45.
90. A. IV, pp. 280-283.
91. A. II, p. 66; IV, p. 283 f.
92. A. II, p. 68.
93. A. IV, p. 283.
94. A. II, p. 74 f.
95. Sn. vv. 258-269; J. 453.
96. Sn. vv. 91-115.
97. D. III, p. 236.
98. M. I, p. 11; In the *Āsava Sutta* it find the six ways that by control, by conscious use of the requisites, by endurance, by avoidance, by ejection and by mind cultivation, A. III, p. 387.

99. Dhp. vv. 292-293.
100. Dhp. v. 253.
101. Dhp. v. 226.
102. D. III, p. 83.
103. Nd. I. s.v. *dukkha*.
104. Cp. samudayo kilesā, Nett. p. 191.
105. A. V, p. 237.
106. M. II, p. 29.
107. D. III, p. 102.
108. Dhp. vv. 368-370.
109. D. III, p. 133.
110. D. III, p. 234.
111. Cp. D. III, pp. 107, 132.
112. A. III, p. 202.
113. MA. I, p. 164 say this is contemplation that is freed from attachment.
114. MA. I, p. 164 say this should be so called because it is freed from ignorance.
115. M. I, pp. 35-36.
116. M. I, p. 200 f.
117. M. I, p. 294 f.
118. M. III, p. 2.
119. Miln. p. 336 sq.
120. A. V, p. 66.
121. D. I, p. 84.
122. D. I, p. 173.
123. Tachibana. S., *'The Ethics of Buddhism'*, Colombo: The Bauddha Sāhitya Sabhā (1961), p. 78.
124. Ps. I, p. 46.
125. E.O.B. Vol. IV, Fascicle I, s.v. *'Cetanā'*.
126. DhsA. p. 351.
127. D. II, p. 120; III, pp. 128, 284.
128. D. II, pp. 79, 303; III, p. 101; M. I, pp. 11, 61; II, p. 12; III, pp. 85, 275; S. I, p. 54; V, pp. 82, 110; A. I, p. 14; IV, p. 23; Nd. I. pp. 14, 45, 171,341;
129. *'The Dhammapada'*, tr. by Radhakrishnan, S., London, Oxford University Press (1950), p. 171.
130. M. I, p. 355.
131. Cf. A. II, p. 13.

132. See M. I, p. 180 (M.L.S. I, p. 226.)
133. See M. I, p. 273.
134. See M. I, p. 273.
135. S. V, p. 126.
136. Tachibana, S., *'The Ethics of Buddhism'*, Colombo: The Bauddha Sāhitya Sabhā (1961), p. 77.
137. A. IV, p. 299.
138. A. I, pp. 254 f.
139. M. I, p. 235.
140. D. III, pp. 213-214.
141. A. II, p. 13.
142. S. I, p. 52.
143. S. I, p. 172.
144. A. I, p. 235.
145. D. III, p. 145.
146. S. III, p. 108.

6
Attitude to Peace

THE THOUGHT OF AHIṀSĀ (NON-INJURE)

Towards Animal

Ahiṁsā is a beautiful act that is regarded as a guarantee for the safety of life not only of man, but also even of life in various other forms creatures by the mind of compassion (*mettā-citta-bhāvanā*). The etymology of *ahiṁsā* is formed by adding the negative pre *'a'* to the word *'hiṁsā'*, a derivative from the root *'han'* meaning 'to kill' and 'to injure'. Accordingly, *ahiṁsā* carries the meaning of not killing, and not injure.[1] In Buddhist humanism *ahiṁsā* is found not only abstention from injure, but also the practice of loving-kindness (*mettā*) to all. From the early period, the principle of *ahiṁsā* has been held in high regard in the *Chāndgya Upanishad*[2] and the various religions of India. However it is different dependent on the doctrinal basis of each religion.

The meaning of *'ahiṁsā'* is given in *Saṁyutta Nikāya* when *brahmins* Bhāradvāja Ahiṁsaka came to visit the Buddha:

> *"As is the name so should its bearer be*
> *Wouldst thou be non-injure (as thou art named)?*
> *Whoso indeed, word, thought ne'er noxious is,*
> *Who on another worketh never harm: -*
> *He verily is (well named) non-injure."*[3]

According to Encylopaedia of Buddhism, *ahiṁsā* is recognized as the synonym with term *avihiṁsā*.[4] Both this term is expressed as abstinence from taking life (*pāṇātipātā veramaṇī*) reference to *sīla* and rules forbidding the killing of living creatures (*pāṇātipātā paṭivirati*) reference to *vinaya*. In the *Saccavibhaṅga Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, it is found in the meaning "Refraining from onslaught on creatures, refraining from taking what has not been given, refraining from going wrongly among the sense-pleasures "[5] *Sutta-Nipāta* advices, "Let him not kill, nor cause to be killed any living being, nor let him approve of others killing, after having refrained from hurting all creatures, both those that are strong and those that tremble in the world."[6]

Regarding to onslaught or killing, *Dhammasaṅganī Aṭṭhakathā* refers to five conditions, which constitute the action of killing: (i) the fact and presence of a living being, human or animal, (ii) the knowledge that the being is a living being, (iii) the intent or resolution to kill, (iv) the act of killing by appropriate means, (v) the resulting death.[7] It is said that if the absence of any one of these conditions were the act of killing would not constitute even though death might follow. The event would be considered an accident without entail any evil effect for the performer of the act. On the other hand, it also mentions six forms of killing viz. (i) killing with one's own hands (*sāhatthika*), (ii) causing another to killing by giving an order (*āṁattika*), (iii) killing by shooting, pelting stones, sticks, etc. (*nissaggiya*), (iv) killing by digging trenches, etc., and entrapping a being (*thāvara*), (v) killing by the powers of *iddhi* or occult means (*iddhimaya*), (vi) killing by mantras, or occult sciences (*vijjāmaya*).[8]

It is said that the thought of *ahiṁsā* is found in Buddhist humanism not only in the meaning to avoid physical harm, but also preclude mental harm. In *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha gave his teaching to the householder Anāthapiṇḍka,

"When householder, the taker of life, by reason of his taking life, breeds dread hatred in this world or breeds dread hatred hereafter, he feels in the mind pain and grief; but he who abstains from taking life, breeds no dread hatred in this world nor none hereafter, he feel in his mind pain and grief; thus that dread hatred for him who abstains from taking life is suppressed."[9]

"Who kills not, nor aught causes to be killed
Who robes not, not makes others rob, for all
Within his heart hath share, he hateth none."[10]

Ahiṁsā (non-injury), psychologically speaking, can be described as the spirit of compassion (*karuṇā*) toward all living creatures. In the same point of view, Sedgwick say, "We ought not to hurt mentally and physically our fellow creatures as well as our fellowmen but to love and to protect them."[11] In the first precepts of the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, the Buddha teaches that one putting away the killing of living beings, holding aloof from the destruction of life. The cudgel and the sword he has laid aside, and ashamed of roughness, and full of mercy, he dwells compassionate and kind to all creatures that have life.[12] This shows that the practice of *ahiṁsā* (non-injury) is not limited to human beings only, but includes all being. In other words, the peaceful attitude of *ahiṁsā* (non-injury) is found in the sympathy to animal.

As Buddhist humanist, the Buddha rejects the traditional customs that causing injury (*hiṁsā*) to any animal and propagates the thought of *ahiṁsā* (non-injury) in the ancient India where has taken place thousands sacrifices.[13] The Buddha criticizes some recluses and *brahmans*, in the *Brahma-gāla Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, who live on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood through the form of vowing, sacrifice, rite to God. In other words, he rejects the opinions which find peace and happy

from a prayer to Gods.[14] "All living beings are not to be harmed,"[15] he says, "At the sort of sacrifice where oxen are slain, or goats, or fowls and pigs, or divers creatures are put an end to is neither of great fruitfulness nor of great profit, nor of great renown; nor of widespread effect. It is just as if a farmer were to enter a wood taking with him plough and seed, and were there, in an untilled tract, in unfavorable soil, among un-uprooted stumps, to plant seeds that were broken, rotten, spoilt by wind and heat, out of season, not in good condition, and the god were not to give good rain in due season."[16] He criticizes *brahmans*'s thoughts 'let there be slain for the sacrifice so many bulls, steers, heifers, goats, rams!' Thinking to make merit, he makes demerit; thinking to do good, he does evil; thinking he seeks the way of happy going, he seeks the way of ill-going.[17]

The practice of *ahiṁsā* there would be some difficult by in some the cases for survive, meat is to be the major food of man and various kinds of animal is killed for those requirements. Moreover, there is question of mosquitoes and flies that carry dangerous, infectious diseases. The Buddha considered also agricultural activities as entailing violence because they led to destruction of life.[18] It is said since man is a mammal; he depends on the struggler for existence and that nobody can be avoided the taking of life. Such as in food and drinking water contains of the countless bacteria and unicellular plants form. Therefore, regarding to layman the Buddha advices they should limit not only killing big animal, but also loving useful beast such as in the *Sutta-Nipāta* mentions agricultural activity's cow is having regarded like unto a mother, a father, a brother, and other relatives the cows are our best friends; they did not kill cows.[19] Regarding to Buddhist *Saṅgha*, the tiny objects as insects, bugs, etc. is forbidden to kill. The Buddha himself said, "Do not let me bring small creatures in their various place to destruction."[20] The spirit *ahiṁsā* (non-injure) avoids the suffering not only

of living beings, but also towards others flora and fauna that that is reason why the Buddha asked to his disciples to remain in one place during the period of three months of rainy season (*vassāna*)[21] which becomes cultivated tradition in Buddhist community under the name of term *vassāvāsa* (dwell in rainy season). Because unmindful walking of monks could have destroyed the life of tiny insects and even many seeds or crops. It is clearly to see Buddhist humanism protects not only animal, but also save from harm of vegetation. The Buddha further says, about those things? They are of five kinds, namely root-germs (*mulabijam-*), stem-germs (*khandhabijam-*), node-germs (*phalubijam-*), plumule-germs (*aggabijam-*) and seed-germs (*bijabijameva-pancamam*).[22] It also finds similar word in the sixth Norms of Human Right: "Humans do not have a right of dominion over animals and the environment, it being recognized that humans along with many other species of animals do change their environment by their very existence."[23]

Buddhist humanism inculcated a high reverence towards life by various methods and prohibited the killing of life. But this does not mean that the Buddha did not allowed the eating of meat. In the five injunctions (*pañca-vatthūni*), Devadatta wanted the Buddha to put into effect; there was a regulation against eating fish or animal meat of any kind. But the Buddha refused to put these five matters into practice. He did prohibit the eating of ten kinds of flesh that were censured by society such as elephant, horses, dog, snake, serpent, lion, tiger, panther, bear and hyena flesh.[24] In the *Jīvaka Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, the Buddha says that in three cases meat may be used: if it is not seen, heard, suspected that an animal was specially killed for the eater and the meat was prepared as food for the eater and the meat was prepared as food for him only (*tikoṭi-parisuddhaṃ*)[25] and it is said meat should only be used in the cases of sickness. He also refers to five ways of *hiṁsā* that stores up

much demerit to wit the action goes and fetches living being, the being is being fetched and experiences pain, the action lead to kill being, the living creature is being killed it experiences pain and distress, and the action proffer meat.[26] Regarding to value of man, the Buddha declared that mutton-butchers, pork-butchers, fowlers, hunters, thugs, fishermen, robbers, cut-throats, jailers, and all others who follow a bloody trade is the low in the value.[27] Further in the *Khuddhaka Nikāya*, the Buddha warns, " someone is a killer of breathing and has wrong view. On the dissolution of the body, after death, he reappears in an animal womb."[28] Because in Buddhist humanism the action of *ahiṁsā* (non-injure) is called good *kamma* that leading man to peace, happy and against the action of *hiṁsā* (injure) conducts to bad *kamma* (action), causing of suffering and pain. The Buddha gives notice his disciples, "If a man speaks or acts with a evil thought, pain follows him (as a consequence) even as the wheel follows the foot of the ox which draws the cart."[29] The evils of *hiṁsā* (injure) are not only the result of suffering in present, but also the consequence of bad *kamma* (action) in future. In the *Lakkhaṇa Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, it is said that one would acquire these three marks of the Superman, to wit: he has projecting heels, has long fingers and toes, and as to his limbs is divinely straight, if he puts away the taking of life, refrained there from and laying the scourge and sword aside, dwelt gentle and compassionate, merciful and friendly to all living creatures, he by the doing and by the accumulating of that *kamma*, by the mass and the abundance thereof, was when the body perished reborn after death in a bright and blessed world.[30]

Towards Human Beings

Buddhist humanism often appeals to the fact that other beings are persons like one having similar feelings, instincts and interests in persuading one to avoid actions, which might

be harmful to others. Other beings like to live just as much as one do not like if they are harmed just as much as one do not like to be harmed. It involves a sense of equality when dealing with other human beings. As the *Saṁyutta Nikāya* puts it: "Here an *Ariyan* (noble) disciple reflects thus: I like to live, I do not like die. I desire happiness and dislike unhappiness. Suppose someone should kill me, since I like to live and do not like to die it would not be pleasing and delightful to me. Suppose I too should kill another who like to live and do not like to die, who desire happiness and does not desire unhappiness it would not be pleasing and delightful to that other person as well. What is not pleasant and delightful to me is not pleasant and delightful to the other person either. How could I inflict upon another that which is not pleasant and not delightful to me? Having reflected in this manner, he (the noble disciple) on his own refrains from killing, and speaks in praise of refraining from killing. In this manner, his bodily conduct becomes pure in three ways."[31]

A clear indication of the humanistic outlook of is the thought of *ahimsā* that exhorts that one should not hurt any beings as *Dhammapada* says, "All tremble before punishment. All fear death. Comparing others with oneself one should not slay, nor cause to slay."[32] Or "All tremble before punishment. Life is death to all. Comparing others with oneself one should not slay, nor cause to slay." (*Sabbe tasanti daṇḍassa- sabbesaṁ jīvitaṁ piya197 Attānaṃ katvā- na haneyya na ghātaye*).[33] Further, *ahiṁsā* is expressed not only the thoughts of compassion and love toward all living beings, but also maintained the feeling of shame because of the brutality and cruelty in killing beings. The *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* cites, "One putting away the killing of living beings holds aloof from the destruction of life. The cudgel and the sword he has laid aside, and ashamed of roughness, and full of mercy, he dwells compassionate and kind to all

creatures that have life."[34] It not only advocated equality of man but also fraternity and compassion.

It is said the Buddha's attitude as a humanist who always strove for peace of mankind. His last minute arrival averted a bloody war between the *Sākyas* – members of the republic from which he himself came – and the *Koliyas*. Both used the waters of a *Rohini* River that ran between their territories, and when the water of the dam at level fell by a severe drought, the laborers of both peoples wanted the water for their own crops. They thus fell to quarrelling and insulting each other, and when those in power heard of these insults, they prepared for war. The Buddha appeared in the nick of time and asked what the conflict was about, at first no one knew, until at last the laborers said that it was over water. In the form of questioned he convinces them of the folly of killing each other for the sake of a little water:

"Why are clansmen in battle array?"

"For the sake of the waters of the *Rohini,* Sir."

"Tell me what is more valuable,"

"Water or human lives?" the Buddha asked.

"Human lives" was the reply.

Thereupon the Buddha asked the "Is it proper for you to kill each other for water which is of less value?" They therefore desisted from the battle to be reconciled and live in peace by the strength of *ahiṁsā*.[35]

In a *Jātaka* story,[36] the *Bodhisattva* is said to have been a king told of the approach of an invading army. In response, he says 'I want no kingdom that must be kept by doing harm', that, by having soldiers defend his kingdom. His wishes are followed, and when the invaders surround the capital, he orders the city's gates to be opened. The invaders enter, and the king is deposed and imprisoned. In his cell, he develops great compassion for the invading king (who will *karmically*

suffer for his unjust action), which leads to this king experiencing a burning sensation in his body. This then prompts him to come to see that he had done wrong by imprisoning a virtuous king. Consequently, he releases him and leaves the kingdom in peace. Here, the message is that the king's non-violent stance managed to save the lives of many people – on both sides. In line with this approach are such verses as: "Conquer anger by love. Conquer evil by good. Conquer the stingy giving. Conquer the liar by truth."[37] Or "Though he should conquer a million men in battlefield, yet he, indeed, is the noblest victor who has conquered himself."[38] Regarding to a war of national independence, Ven. Walpola Rahula described, "To fight against a foreign invader for national independence became an established Buddhist tradition, since freedom was essential to the spiritual as well as the material progress of the community."[39]

Buddhist humanism denies all violent actions and manifestations under any pretext except in legitimate self-defense. Suppose another, to annoy, provokes you with some odious act, why suffer anger to spring up, and do as he would have you do? If you get anger, then maybe you make him suffer, maybe not; though with the hurt that anger brings you certainly are punished now.[40] The content of non-injure (*ahiṁsā*) is not only considered as primary heading in a previous life of the Buddha as a king Brahmadatta of *Benares*, but also heading in the eleventh century, when invading Muslim Turks smashed Buddhist monasteries and universities at *Nālandā*, it appears that the monks offered no resistance. In the *Puṇṇovāda Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the account is given of the fearless monk Puṇṇa, who told the Buddha that he was going to live and teach among the people of *Sunāparanta*. When the Buddha pointed out that they were fierce people, who would revile him, he simply said that he would then look at them as good people if they did not actually strike him with their hands. If they did do this,

though, he would look at them as good for not hitting him with clods of earth. If they did this, he would look at them as good if they did not strike him with sticks, and so on for striking with a knife but not killing him. Finally, he said that if they killed him, this would simply bring the body, with its disgusting features, to an end. It is then said that he went on to gain many disciples among the people of *Sunāparanta*.

In the *Brahma-gāla Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, it is said, "Putting away the killing of living things, Gotama the recluse holds aloof from the destruction of life. He has laid the cudgel and the sword aside, and ashamed of roughness, and full of mercy, he dwells compassionate and kind to all creatures that have life."[41] The *Khuddaka Nikāya* cites that the unprofitable action beginning with killing breathing things is enumerated as the foolish which killer will receive bad fruit by his evil action. It is said, "Just as a fire that starts in a rush shed or a grass shed burns down even an upper chamber plastered within and without, closed off, second off, secured by bars, with windows shuttered, so too, whatever fears, all arise owing to fools, not owing to wise men. Whatever perils arise whatever calamities arise, all arise owing to fools, not owing to wise men. While the fool brings fear, the wise man does not. While the fool brings peril, the wise man does not. While the fool brings calamity, the wise man does not."[42] It also is said in *Jātaka*:

"Now when a man ties up with blades
Of Kusa grass some fetid fish,
The blades of grass get fetid too:
Such is consorting with a fool."[43]

To contrary this any creatures that follow out the ten profitable courses of action with abstention from killing breathing things is called the wise. They are as capable of eliminating all fear, risk and calamity for those who give effect to their words as are protection in a rebellion, a lamp

in darkness, food and drink and so on in a state of being overcome by pain of hunger and thirst and so on.[44]

The meaning of injure (*hiṁsā*) towards human beings is understood as taking life, seize and slay him or put him in fetters or thrust him forth (from the country) or wreak their wrath upon him. And 'killing a human being with intent' are also included, besides killing by one's own hand such actions as ordering others to kill, and also giving advice leading others to commit suicide. Abortion is also place on the same level as killing a human being. The Buddha refers to the consequence of action can be harmful (*hiṁsā*) to human in several ways such as the matter of violence and war.

Violence (*sāhasa*) and war (*yuddha*) is considered as the form of *hiṁsā* (injure) that is the factor causes sufferings, anguish, pain, and grief as Walpola Rahula notes, "according to Buddhism there is nothing that can be called a 'just war'- which is only a false term coined and put into circulation to justify and excuse hatred, cruelty, violence and massacre."[45] Therefore, the Buddha carries out the campaign to prevent from the battle, which arise when the evil king of *Magadha*, Ajātasattu attacks the land of his uncle king *Kosalan* Pasenadi, (a follower of the Buddha) who is said to be 'a friend to, an intimate of, mixed up with, whatever is good'. But his campaign cannot stop that battle. To see the misery of king Pasenadi who is defeated and retreats in the first battle, the Buddha said verses:

"Conquest engenders hate; the conquered lives
In misery. But whoso is at peace
And passionless, happily doth he live;
Conquest hath he abandoned and defeat."[46]

In similar, it also points out in the *Dhammapada*, "Victory breeds hatred. The defeated live in pain. Happily the peaceful live, giving up victory and defeat."[47] The two kings met again

in the second battle, king Pasenadi defeated Ajātasattu and captured him alive. Under the influence of the spirit of non-injure (*ahiṁsā*) in Buddhist humanism, king Pasenadi confiscated entire army - elephants, horses, chariots and infantry – and leave king Ajātasattu only his life. To this regarding, the Buddha uttered verses:

"A man may spoil another, just so far
As it may serve his ends, but when he's spoiled
By others he, despoiled, spoiled, spoils yet again.
So long as evil's fruit is not matured,
The fool doth fancy 'now's the hour, the chance!'
But when the deed bears fruit, he fareth ill.
The slayer gets a slayer in his turn;
The conqueror gets one who conquers him;
Th' abuser wins abuse, th' annoyer, fret.
Thus by the evolution of the deed,
A man who spoils is spoiled in his turn."[48]

Non-injure or non-violence (*ahiṁsā*) of Buddhist humanism is found in regarding to earning livelihood. As a bee moves to the different flowers and without causing any harm either to the shape or color of the flowers, collects sustenance or maintains its living; similarly, the Buddha teaches the best way is that of a bee, one should earn his livelihood without causing any injury to any one.[49] Therefore, the Buddha has strictly forbid trading of earning livelihood that conduce man to worries and fears as trade in weapons (*sattha-vaṇijjā*), trade in human beings (*satta-vaṇijjā*), trade in flesh (*maṁsa-vaṇijjā*), trade in intoxicants (*majja-vaṇijjā*) and trade in poisons (*visa-vaṇijjā*).[50] It is clearly that Buddhist humanism do not approve career of unrighteous earnings can cause the hurt for man including the fighting-man or soldier. In *Saṁyutta Nikāya* fighting-man (*yodha-ājīvo*), the

trainer said, "I have heard traditional saying of teachers of old who were fighting-men: 'A fighting-man who in battle exerts himself, puts forth, thus exerting himself and putting forth effort is tortured and put an end to by others. Then, when body breaks up, after death he is reborn in the company of *devas* of Passionate Delight (*Sarañjita*).' What says the Exacted One of this?"[51] In response, the Buddha is silent, but when fighting-men persists in his question, he expounds that in the case of a fighting-man who in battle exerts himself, puts forth effect that beings be tortured, be bound, be destroyed, be exterminated Then, so exerting himself, so putting forth effort, other men torture him and make an end of him. When body breaks up, after death he is reborn in the hell. The Buddha adds that the traditional saying of teachers of old who were fighting-men for rebirth in the company of *devas* of Passionate Delight is only pervert view which two paths is open, either purgatory or rebirth as an animal.[52] Buddhist humanism clearly points out bad result by act of violence, either in this life or in the next such as "one who destroys the life of any being may, in his next birth, meet death unexpectedly while in the prime of life, even thought he is possessed of all the amenities of life, wealth and beauty like King of Passion."[53] This result of bad *kamma* (action) is caused by his action in the balance law of universal without any interfere from outer sources as gods or *devas*. In the *Vasala Sutta* of *Sutta-Nipāta* the Buddha (*Bhagavat*) said to Aggikabhāradvāga the reasons of an outcast or the things that make an outcast. That is man who is angry and bears hatred, who is wicked and hypocritical, who has embraced wrong views, who is deceitful; man who in this world harm living beings, whether once or twice born, and in whom there is no compassion for living beings; man who destroys or lays siege to villages or towns, and is known as an enemy.[54]

Furthermore, in the *Brahmagāla Sutta* and *Potthapāda Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, the Buddha advices that monks should

avoid talk of various matter including tales of kings, of robbers, of ministers of state, tales of war, of terrors, of battles.[55] In some irresistible case, many Buddhist humanists have to join in the defense of the community or nation in times of need. They might say, yet, to war with the heart of loving-kind and compassion. In other words, they should become the soldier of peace, if possible as Buddhist monk did during the Vietnam War that they do not struggle in the interest of self against truth and justice, who struggles out of self-interest to make them great or powerful or rich or famous, will have no reward. But they who struggle for peace and truth will have great reward; even his defeat will be deemed a victory. If they must go to battle they should extinguish all hatred in them mind that saving people is them goal rather than killing an adversary. They who have conquered themselves are more fit to live, to be successful and to gain victories than is the person who is the slave of self. They who will make peace and gain a victory for the fruits of that victory will remain forever. Because they recognize that fruit of killing is not the decisive factor leading to the end of war, to the solution of lasting peace.

Killing and various forms of violence proceed from the fact that it has not attained maturity in a person's mind. In cultivating love, man is expected to extend his thoughts of love with a mind free from enmity, in all directions encompassing within him thoughts of friendliness, compassion, and sympathetic joy to all living beings great and small. No limit should be recognized regarding the extent to which this boundless compassion should pervade. One is required to universalize the kind of love a mother has towards her one and only child, "Just as a mother would protect her only child at the risk of her own life, even so, let one cultivate a boundless heart of compassion towards all living beings. Let one's thoughts of boundless compassion pervade the whole world: above, below and across without

any obstruction, without any hatred, without any enmity."[56] In the *Mettā Sutta* of *Sutta-Nipāta* the Buddha says, "Whatever living beings there are, either feeble or strong, all either long or great, middle-size, short, small or large, either seen or which are not unseen, and which live far or near, either born or seeking birth, may all creatures be happy-mind." - "Let no one deceive another, let him not despise any person whatsoever in any place. Let one not out of anger or anger or resentment wish any harm to another."[57] Indeed, the power of loving of the Buddha is not only prevent violent act (*hiṁsā*), but also can convert a people as mentioned in the story of Aṅgulimāla, who is said a hunter, bloody-handed, bent on death and destruction, merciless to living creatures; who made villages were depopulated and market towns were depopulated and country districts were depopulated; who wore a garland of fingers from his constant killing of people. The robber Aṅgulimāla grasping his sword and shield and arming himself with bow and quiver followed close after the Lord. Although walking with all his strength was not to catch up with the Lord who was walking at an ordinary pace with a wonder of psychic power.

-"Standing still, recluse, standing still recluse."

-"I am standing still, Aṅgulimāla, you too stand still."

-"While you are walking, recluse, you say: 'I am standing still,' and you tell me, who am standing still, that I am not standing still. I ask you, recluse, about this matter: How is it that you are standing still, yet I am not standing still?"

-"I, Aṅgulimāla, am standing still, having for all beings everywhere laid aside the stick, but you are unrestrained regarding creatures; therefore I am standing still, you are not standing still."[58]

Then the robber had got rid of evil, hearing *Dhamma* from Lord's teaching. He hurled his sword and weapons

down and asked for the going forth as *Bhikkhu*. In *Dhammapada* the Buddha states, "One who has laid aside the cudgel in his dealings with beings, whether feeble or strong, who neither harms nor kills, - him I call a *Brahmaṇa*."[59]

To distinguish degree of depravity reference to the beings as the victim, the commentary of *Dīgha Nikāya* said that the degree is low in the killing of smaller living beings; the degree is great in the case of bigger living beings. Furthermore, in the case of animal, it is low of more useful living beings and it is great of more useful living beings; in the case of human beings, the degree of depravity is low of less virtuous beings and it is more of higher virtuous beings.[60] As Malalasekera writes, "The statement *ahiṁsā paramo dhammā*- that non-injury is the highest law implies that the moral factor is the backbone of law, and that individual and not the state is the ultimate subject of law. It asserts that the rights of man are grounded in a law superior to the laws of state. It forbids us to commit crimes against humanity including such things as the denial or the exploitation of others. Thus the law of *ahiṁsā* is one the greatest expressions of human rights "[61]

The ideal of non-violence (*ahiṁsā*) in Buddhist humanism is necessary as the policy for ruler who embraces to *Dhamma* by protecting all sections of the population from crime and poverty, and consulting with religious people on what is wholesome and unwholesome.[62] Among the best-known names of individuals who practiced the *ahiṁsā* was the great Buddhist emperor Asoka of India in the 3rd century B.C. His Thirteenth Rock Edict, which refers to his decimation when subjugated the country of *Kāliṅga* during the eighth year, 150,000 people were deported, 100,000 killed and many times that number died.[63] This issue brought about in him through his conversion, he felt deeply the great misery and sorrow of war. He gave up war and followed a policy of reconciliation and peace. Based on the principles of his *ahiṁsā*

are expressed in the imperial edicts, it is said that he realized man's true happiness lay in practicing the Buddha's teaching *ahiṁsā*. The forms of sacrifice of animals as offering were prohibiting; the eating of meat was restricted and, even in the palace, the killing of animals for the king's table was reduced to a minimum. This was a prohibition against the needless killing of animals. Again, among the animals that were permitted to be killed, those that were pregnant, and the young under six months were not allowed to be killed; the castration of domestic animals, the branding of cattle and horses, and the burning of forests for no reason at all, or to kill wild life, were prohibited. He worked in a positive way for the love and protection of animals. He built hospitals for both men and animals; he cultivated medicinal plants, planted trees by the roadside and dug numerous wells, thus serving the needs of both man and beast. Asoka, in this way, spread the influence of Buddhism over the whole of India, which tremendous influences lasted for a long period of time in the spiritual life of the India people.[64]

Modern history of humankind also is known renowned peoples as Dalai Lama XIV who is received the Peace Prize in the solution to restore independence of Tibet, Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent struggle against religious intolerance and British rule in India, and Rev. Martin Luther King's black people's civil rights movement in the United States etc. All of them struggle in the spirit of non-violence (*ahiṁsā*) by power of compassion (*mettā-cetovimutti*). Therefore, to ensure the process real peace of Buddhist humanism trend towards the avoidance of oppression, cultural and intellectual coercion is necessary to practice and cultivate the feeling and thought of compassion towards innumerable and infinite kinds of life that is called the mind of boundless compassion (*mettā-appamaññā*). It is right as suggestion of Nandasena Ratnapala: "*Ahiṁsā* is not confined to abstention from injury etc. to others. It involves a positives philosophy that is the

practice of friendliness, helping all living beings and being kind to them. Such compassion or friendliness begins with oneself, and then extended to others. In thought, word and action, this friendliness; this compassion, finds expression and is gradually in creased. *Ahiṁsā* is thus a total way of life, practical in all aspects. Because it recognizes reality and attempts to arrive at realistic solutions that cannot be put into practice."[65]

THE DIMENSION OF HARMONY

The ideology of egolessness (no self)

Distorted perceptions, which fuel conflict, are clear forms of delusion. The deepest delusion is the 'I am' conceit: the feeling or attitude that one has a permanent, substantial self or 'I' that must be protected at all cost. As part of the process of building up their self-image, people invest much of their identity in 'my country', my community, my religion or even 'my gender'. This 'entity' is seen as being threatened or offended.

So relationship with a group, which in one sense helps take a person out of egocentric preoccupation, then becomes the basis for a group-wide 'egō' that can itself be 'offended'. Grasping at 'the wrangling of views, the jungle of views' can be seen to have led to religious and ideological wars (offensive or defensive), crusades, bloody revolutions, and gas chambers. Indeed, millions of deaths were caused, in the twentieth century, by those attached to particular ideologies, which 'justified' their actions: Hitler, Stalin, the Khmer Rouge, and terrorists of various kinds. The Buddha said in the *Mahādukkhakkhandha Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* that sense-pleasures lead on to desire for more sense-pleasure, which leads on to conflict between all kinds of people, including rulers, and thus quarrelling and war. One is the

strand of sense-pleasures through five-organs viz. material shapes cognizable by the eye, sounds cognizable by the ear, smells cognizable by the nose, tastes cognizable by the tongue, touches cognizable by the body that agreeable, pleasant, liked, enticing, connected with sensual pleasures, alluring. Whatever pleasure, whatever happiness arises in consequence of these five strands of sense-pleasures, this is the satisfaction in sense-pleasures. By having pleasures of the senses as the cause, having pleasures of the senses as the provenance, being a consequence of pleasures of the senses, the very cause of pleasures of the senses that conflict and variance in individual and society happened such as "kings dispute with kings, nobles dispute with nobles, *brahmans* dispute with *brahmans*, householders dispute with housedress, a mother dispute with son, a son dispute with his mother, a father dispute with his son, a son dispute with his father, a brother dispute with a brother, a brother dispute with a sister, a sister dispute with a brother, a friend dispute with a friend. Those who enter into quarrel, contention, dispute and attack one another with their hands with stones (*leḍḍu*) and with sticks and with weapons. They have taken sword and shield, girded on bow and quiver, both sides mass for battle and arrows are hurled and knives are hurled and swords are flashing. They break into a house and carry off the booty and behave as a thief and wait in ambush and go to other men's wives. Kings having arrested such a one, deal out various punishments as lashing, cutting off his hand, his foot They behave wrongly in body, in speech, in thought."[66] In the *Potaliya Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha says to householder, an *Ariya* (Noble) disciple reflects that pleasures of the senses have been likened to a skeleton; a lump of flesh; a grass torch; a pit of glowing embers; a dream; what is borrowed; the fruits of a tree, by the Lord, of much pain, of much tribulation, wherein is more peril.[67]

The delusion in pleasures of the senses, it is considered in Buddhist humanism that is the source of ego or self (*attā*) which it takes the characteristic forms of hatred, aggression and driving acquisitiveness that become strongly rooted not only individuals but in whole cultures to bring about disagreement, discord and disharmony. In Buddhist humanism, the five sort of selfness are mentioned, namely, *āvāsa-macchariya* (avarice on count of sojourn, dwelling, living), *kula-macchariya* (avarice on account of family name, group), *lābha- macchariya* (avarice on account of receiving, acquisition), *vaṇṇa-macchariya* (avarice on account of race), *dhamma-macchariya* (avarice on account of object). Selfishness is one of the evil conditions, which have to be renounced as habits of mind by force of intelligence.[68] What is the use of such an understanding leads to removal or weakening of attachment avarice, stinginess, envy, grasping and selfishness (*macchariya*)?

For that reason, theory of *anattā* (ego or self) occupied main position towards building up a way of life for the humanity. The question is required that what the meaning of theory of *anattā* (ego or self) is. The theory means there is not (*an*) a permanence self (*attā*) within each individual being. For investigation, three hypotheses of self are put forward in the *Mahānidāna Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*.[69] The first hypothesis is that the self is feeling (*vedanā*). It is argued that feelings are threefold: pleasant, painful and neutral. They are impermanent, products and certain to pass away. If, when a pleasant feeling exists, the conclusion is drawn 'this is my self' then, when a painful feeling supersedes it, one must conclude 'my self has passed away'. Therefore, feeling is called to regard self as impermanent, changed of happiness and pain and liable to begin and end. The next hypothesis is that the self is neither feeling nor is insentient, i.e., the soul and the body are identical. This would mean that where there is no feeling it is impossible to say 'I am' for a self I without

self-reference has no meaning. The last hypothesis, the self is regarded not identical with feeling, but as possessing feeling. If so, the self were feeling of every kind to cease absolutely, then they're being no feeling whatever; no one could say 'I myself am.'

The conception of the individual in Buddhist humanism expressed in different ways, but all of them essentially consist of *nāma* and *rūpa*, 'name' and 'form' mind and matter, or mind and body. More usually, he is said to consist of five *khandhas*, (groups, masses, aggregates), given as *rūpa* (the physical body), *vedanā* (feelings, sensations), *saññā* (perceptions), *saṅkhāra* (variously translation as tendencies, dispositions, character-complexes) and *viññāṇa* (cognition, consciousness, intellect). Body corresponds to *rūpa* and the four other *khandhas* to mind (*nāma*). Elsewhere, e.g., in the *Sammādiṭṭhi Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, mind (*nāma*) is said to consist of feeling, perception volition (*cetanā*), contact (*phassa*) and attention (*manasikāra*), while body (*rūpa*) is defined as being made up of the four great (*mahābhūta*) earth, water, wind and fire, which are common both to the world and to the individual.[70] Being (*upādinna*) are described in Buddhist humanism taken up assimilated by the consciousness (*viññāṇa*) in order to continue the existence to which it is bound by its earlier activities.[71]

The conceptions of individual are found further expanded. The human being was analyzed into its component parts, entered into relationship was with the external world. This relationship is replied on the groundwork of cognition (*viññāṇa*), of cognitive faculties (*indriya*) and their objects. These faculties and their objects are called *āyatana*, which means 'place', or 'sphere' or 'entrance'. This term is used to include both sense and sense-object, the meeting of which, two is necessary for cognition, so these factors that together comprise cognition. In other words, the sense-faculty, the sense-object and the resultant

consciousness, are identified as element (*dhātu*). The human personality including the external world, with which it enters into relationship, is thus divided into *khandha* (aggregation), *āyatana* (sphere) and *dhātu* (element). The generic name for all three of them is *Dhamma*, which, in this context, is translated as 'element of existence'. Hence, the significance of the formula already referred to *sabbe dhammā anattā* (all existence is egolessness). The *Mahāhatthipadoma Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* shows the four elements (*dhātus*) of existence, namely, the element of extension, the liquid element, the element of heat, the element of motion. Regarding to an individual (*niyaka*), the element of extension includes of hair of the head, the hair of the body, nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinews, bones, marrow of the bones, kidney, heart, liver, pleura, spleen, lungs, intestines, mesentery, stomach, excrement, or whatever other thing is hard, solid; the liquid element is of bile, phlegm, pus, blood, sweat, fat, tears, serum, saliva, mucus, synovial fluid, urine or whatever other thing is liquid, fluid; the heat element is by whatever one is vitalized, consumed, burnt up and by whatever one has munched, drunk, eaten and tasted that is properly transmuted (in digestion); the motion element is of winds going upwards, downwards, winds in the abdomen, winds in the belly, winds that shoot across the several limbs, in-breathing, out-breathing, or whatever other thing is motion, wind. By means perfect intuitive wisdom it should be seen of this as it really is, thus: 'This is not mine, this am I not, this is not myself.' So what of this short-lived body derived from craving? There is not anything here for saying 'I' or 'mine' or 'I am.'[72]

Buddhist humanism emphasizes the conception of ego or self is not found in these elements of existence. Therefore one should think matter... (*rūpa* etc.) is not self. The caused and condition for the arising of matter (etc.) are not self, so, it is asked, how could matte (etc.) which is brought into being

by what is not self, be self.[73] If matter is self then the body would not be subject to affliction, one should be able to say to it 'let my body he thus, let my body be not thus'. But, this is not possible. The body is shifting, ever in change and, therefore, ever accompanied by misery and affliction. Accordingly, it cannot be the self. The same is repeated for the other respected for the other aspects of the personality. The conclusion is, therefore, reached that all these things, whether past, future or presently arisen, in oneself or external, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, far or near, are all to be viewed thus: 'This is not mine (*etam mama*), this is not what I am (*eso hamasmi*), this is not my self (*eso me attā*).' Then it is added, when a man realizes that all these things are not the self, he turns away from them and by the extinction of desire he attains released. It reveals the Buddha's purpose in enunciating his doctrine that all misery arises from the delusion of self, which causes man to strive to profit himself and to injure others. The most effective therapeutic against the folly of seeking to gratify longings is the realization that there is no truth in permanent self.

According to Buddhist humanism the human conflict is due to egoism, and that it is ego-consciousness that shapes and gives a particular aspect to the relationship between inner individual and the world outside. The world outside is not real "Because the world is empty of an ego (*attā*), and of something belonging to the ego (*attāniya*), therefore the world is called empty. But which are the things that empty of an ego? Empty of an ego is eye and visible objects, ear and sounds, nose and odors, tongue and tastes, body and bodily impressions, mind and mind objects." [74] It is said that, therefore " Consciousness (mind) is egolessness or no self. Also the causes and conditions arising of consciousness are likewise egolessness. Then how could it be possible that consciousness having arisen through something, which is Egolessness, could ever be an ego?"[75]

As recorded in the *Mahātaṇhāsankhaya Sutta* of *Majjhima-Nikāya,* a monk *Sāti* misunderstood the teaching of the Buddha and held the view that consciousness is a permanent entity that passes from one existence to another and continues without break of identity (*anañña*) 'Thus it is that I, your reverences, understand *Dhamma* taught by the Lord, that it is this consciousness itself that runs on, fares on, not another.' His concept of consciousness (*viññāṇa*) is similar to '*nirasraya vijnana*' discussed in the *Upaniṣads,* which has emphasized consciousness to mean soul or ego. The Buddha rebuked to him and explained that there is no arising of consciousness without relative conditions (*annatra paccaya natthi viññanassa sambhavo*).[76] The Buddha has criticized the consideration of consciousness as a permanent entity. He states, "Apart from condition there is no origination of consciousness."[77]

The Buddha was once asked: If there is no permanent self, then who is affected by the acts, which the 'no-self' has performed? Buddha reproves the questioner saying: 'shall one who is under the dominion of desire, think to go beyond the mind of the Master?' meaning thereby, perhaps, that the question is wrongly put because there is an assumption in it of a permanent self.[78] In the *Bhāra Sutta* of *Saṁyutta Nikāya*[79] speaks of the burden, the taking of the burden, the grasping of the burden and the laying down of the burden. As Keith[80] has been translated 'burden-bearer' or 'burden taking' as supporting the view that individual is an *attā* or self, apart from the five *khandhas*. And yet, this is what he taught Rāhula, "Now Rāhula, when a monk by perfect wisdom realizes with regard to the elements (which comprise the human being) 'this is not mine, this is not I, this is not my self (*attā*)', then does he cut himself off from craving, loosen bonds and by overcoming the vain, conceit (of *attā*) make an end of suffering." His mind is defiled by egoistic terms in the certain of ignorance as the *Sutta-Nipāta* stated, "In whatever egoistic

terms they think an object, up so facto it becomes otherwise. And herein verily lays its falseness, the deceptive phenomena that it is."[81] As the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* says, "A person who knows and sees things as they are need not make an effort of will saying, 'I shall become detached'. It is the nature of things (*dhammatā*) that a person who knows and sees becomes detached."[82]

Term *upādānakkhanda* is used in Buddhism humanism as the meaning be *khandhas* i.e. aggregates that have been defiled by grasping.[83] Such as when gripped by the attachment of greed (*lobha*) a person may think 'I have power and I wand power', so as to persecute others.[84] Hatred (*dosa*), abhorrence, detestation perhaps fuelled by propaganda at times of conflict, may spring from attachment to certain goods or issues. Fear, close to hatred, may also motive evil actions, whether or not it is justified.[85] One, being deceived, defrauded and cheated by one's mind, grasping grasps form, feeling, perception, obsession and consciousness; and depending on this grasping arise the whole mass of *dukkha*, the whole mass of variance.

With the insight of 'egolessness' or 'no self' a Buddhist humanist will runs away the grip of both greed (*lobha*) and anger (*dosa*). One is greedy of something for oneself, but when the self is not there greed loses its target and has no incentive to exist. The same goes for anger. When the self is contradicted unsatisfied anger would arise. But when the self is not there anger will automatically disappear. This happens explained the Buddha's verses 'Health is the highest gain, *Nibbāna* the highest bliss' that is said in the *Māgandiya Sutta* of *Majjhima-Nikāya*.[86] To cure negative effect of attachment to speculative or fixed views, dogmatic opinion the Buddha says, "Let him completely cut off the root of what is called *papañka* (delusion), thinking 'I am wisdom' – all the cravings that arise inwardly, let him learn to subdue them, always being thoughtful."[87]

Therefore, one should have increasing control over by developing more self-control seeing in this matter the mind has gone away from notions of an 'I' and of 'mine' and from vain conceits, transcending the forms thereof, is at peace and well enfranchised.[88] It is said that any virtuous layman (who abstains from taking life, from taking what is not given, from fleshly lusts, from lying and from drinking spirituous liquors that cause indolence) recognized the way of Mirror of Truth, he should do desire, himself predict of himself: "Purgatory is destroyed for me; and rebirth as an animal, or a ghost, or in any place of woe. I am converted; I am no longer liable to be reborn in a state of suffering and am assured of finally attaining to the enlightenment (of *Arahantship*)."[89] In other words, he established in the fourfold peace and happiness on self-control as in the *Dhammapada,* the Buddha said to his disciple: *"Attanā coday' attānaṃ - paṭimāse attam attanā. So attagutta satimā – sukhaṃ bhikkhu vihāhisi"* (By self do you censure yourself. By self do you examine yourself. Self-guarded and mindful, O *bhikkhu*, you live happily).[90] Dalai Lama XIV notes, "Our very life is a paradox, contradictory in many senses; whenever you have too much of one thing you have problems created by that. You always have extremes and therefore it is important to try and find the middle way, to balance the two."[91]

Harmonious opinion

It is noteworthy that "nothing wrong with material progress provided man takes precedence over progress. In fact it has been my firm belief that in order to solve human problems in all their dimensions we must be able to combine and harmonize external material progress with inner mental development."[92] The term 'harmony' derived from *Pāli 'sāmaggiya'* (from Greek *'harmonia'*) which occupied the important role in the conflicting solution of man and society. In the *Sāmagāma Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha showed

the six sources of dispute viz. angry and bears ill-will; harsh and unmerciful; envious and grudging; crafty and deceitful; evil desires and wrong views; infected with worldliness, obstinate and stubborn that brings forth the woe of the many-folk, the grief of the many-folk, misfortune of the populace, the sorrow of *devas* and mankind.[93]

It is filled with concern in Buddhist humanism such as in the *Cūḷagosiṇga Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha asked Anuruddhas how is it that you are living all together on friendly terms and harmonious as milk and water blend, regarding one another with the eye of affection? Anuruddhas answers that they are living with such fellow Brahma-fares, friendliness as to acts of body, whether openly or in private, has risen up in them; friendliness as to acts of speech, whether openly or in private, has risen up in them; friendliness as to acts of thought, whether openly or in private, has risen up in them. The Buddha approves this view of Anuruddhas, as well as and encourages they should live merged together in their minds through diligent, ardent, self-resolute and mutual love.[94]

Indeed, monks, when the order is harmonious, there are not mutual betrayals. Thereupon those who are at variance are reconciled, and between those who are at one there is further growth of unity.

"A blessed thing is concord in the order.
The friend of those who are in harmony,
Of concord fain and fixed in righteousness,
From peace from bondage he falls not away.
Making the concord of the company
Age-long doth he rejoice i' the heaven world."[95]

It is said that one should practices peace say as well-spokenness; speak but the True Ideal, naught else; speak only kindly, not unkindly; speak only truth and nothing false.[96]

Buddhist humanism considered harmony as important factor to the balance of an organization or a community. In the *Sāmagāma Sutta,* the Buddha expounds the seven ways to settle a dispute in Buddhist *Saṅgha* from time to time:

1. *Sammukhavinayo databbo* (a verdict in the presence may be given): Reaching a consensus by drawing out the implications of agreed principles.
2. *Sativinaya databbo* (a verdict of reminiscence may be given): Setting aside an offence, which has been, acknowledges with the promise not to repeat it.
3. *Amulhavinayo databbo* (a verdict of past insanity may be given): Overlooking monastic offences which the guilty party cannot remember committing.
4. *Patinnaya karetabbam* (the decision may be carried out on his acknowledge): Overlooking apparent offences committed when a person was out of his mind.
5. *Yebhuyassika* (the decision of the majority): Majority voting if this dispute fails for consensus.
6. *Tassa papiyyasika* (the decision for specific depravity): Censure of a monk who only acknowledges a serious offence under cross-questioning, after having denied it.
7. *Tinavatthrako* (the covering up with grass): ignoring striving, quarrelling that was not worthy of a recluse.[97]

In this *Kosambiya Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya,* the Buddha expounded six things are to be remembered that making for affection, making for respect, they conduce to concord, to lack of contention, to harmony and unity:

1. One should offer his fellow *Brahma*-farers a friendly act of body both in public and in private.

2. One should offer a friendly act of speech in private.
3. One should offer a friendly act of thought in private.
4. One should be one to enjoy sharing such acquisitions, whatever are those lawful acquisitions, lawfully acquired, if they be even but what is put into the begging bowl, to enjoy the in common with his virtuous fellow *Brahma*-fares.
5. One should dwell united in moral habits that are faultless, without flaw, spotless, without blemish, freeing, praised by wise men, untarnished, conducive to concentration such as these with his fellow *Brahma*-farers, both in public and in private.
6. One should dwell united whatever view is *Ariyan*, leading onwards, leading him who acts according to it to the complete destruction of anguish in such a view as this with his fellow *Brahma*-farers, both in public and in private.[98]

For the social harmony and concord in Buddhist humanism, the term *catu-sangahavatthuni*[99] (four conditions for social welfare) viz. *dāna* (generosity), *piyavaca* (kindly speech), *atthacariyā* (helpful action) and *samānattatā* (impartiality or equal participation) is used as needful conditions. *Dāna*, giving or generosity, is more or less a basic stance towards others in society, an attitude of generosity, which can be based on goodwill, compassion, or gladness, through giving as an act of encouragement. The five right ways of giving are: (i) giving in faith, (ii) giving with deference, (iii) giving in time, (iv) giving with unconstrained heart and (v) giving without hurt oneself or the others.[100] It means that one is willing to share and share equitably, the rich to help the poor and the strong to help the weak, thus creating goodwill. When Sīha, the general asking the visible result of giving, the Buddha declared five things, namely, the liberal man who is good and dear to many fold; the good

and wise follow him; the good report concerning him goes about; whatever company he enters, be it of nobles, *brālmans*, householders, or recluses, he enters with confidence and untroubled (*amaṅkubhūta*); the almsgiver, on the breaking up of the body after death, is reborn in the happy heaven world.[101] The giving of Buddhist humanism is recognized as the element of harmony. It is found the advice of king to his son in the *Cakkavatti-Sīhanāda Sutta* that let no wrongdoing prevail and if whosoever in the kingdom is poor, to let wealth be given as the duty of Wheel-turning Monarch.[102] *Piyavaca*, kindly speech, can be based on all four of the Sublime States. Friendly speech, based on goodwill, as standard behavior in everyday situations; kindly speech, based on compassion, in times of difficulty, as with words of advice or condolence; and congratulatory speech, based on gladness, as in words of encouragement in times of happiness and success. However, when confronted with problems in social situations, kindly speech can be expressed as impartial and just speech, which is based on equanimity. In *Aṅguttara Nikāya* it says to five things of speaking, namely, speaking about what has happened (*bhūtena*), not speaking what has not; speaking with gentleness, not harshness; speaking about the goal (*attha-saṅhitena*), not about what is not the goal; speaking with mind of amity, not of ill-will. In other words, one should not have heard something here or elsewhere and to repeat it for (causing) variance among these people that concord is his pleasure, his delight, his joy, and the motive of his speech. His speech is gentle, pleasing to the ear, affectionate, going to the heart, urbane, pleasant to the many-folk, agreeable to the many-folk. He is one that not only abstains from frivolous chatter, but also speaks at a right time, fact words on *Dhamma* that are treasuring, with an opportune simile, discriminating, connected with the goal.[103] Further the Buddha advices man should be a reconciler of those who are at variance, and one who

combines those who are friends. Concord is his pleasure, concord his delight, concord his joy, concord is the motive of his speech.[104] *Atthacariyā*, helpful action refers to the offering of physical effort to help others. In the first factor, generosity, we had the giving of material goods. In the second factor, kindly speech, we have the offering of gentle speech. With this third item we have the offering of physical effort in the form of helpful conduct. This help can be on ordinary occasions, such as offering help in a situation where the recipient is not in any particular difficulty. Help in this instance is more or less a 'friendly gesture,' and so is based on goodwill. Help can be offered in times of difficulty, in which case it is based on compassion. Help can be offered as an encouragement in times of success, in which case it is based on sympathetic joy or gladness at the good fortune of others. Thus, *atthacariyā*, helpful conduct, may be based on any of these three Sublime States. *Samānattatā* means to share with other people's pleasures and pains, to join in with them, to be one with them. It refers to sharing, cooperating and joining in. We could say that it means to be humble, such as when helping others in their undertakings even when it is not one's duty, or to be fair, such as when arbitrating in a dispute. One who reunites those who are divvied, a promoter of friendships, who enjoys concord, rejoices in concord, delights in concord, and a speaker of words that promote concord.[105] In the *Sangīti Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, the Buddha shows nine suppressions of quarrelling that bringing about concord, not wrangling viz. quarrelling is suppressed by the thought that he has done, is doing, will do me an injure; he has done, is doing, will do an injure to one I love; he has bestowed a benefit, is bestowing, will bestow a benefit on one I dislike.[106]

When asked by the *Sakyan* Daṇḍapāṇi that what the gist of his teachings was, the Buddha replied in the *Madhupiṇḍi Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* explicitly, "According

to my teachings, among the world of the *Devas*, *Māras* and *Brahmās*, with crowds of recluses and *brāhmanas*, deities and human beings, there will be no quarrel whatsoever with anyone in the world."[107] Further, he declared, "Oh *Bhikkhus*, I do not quarrel with the world, only the world quarrels with me. Oh *Bhikkhus*, a speaker of the *Dhamma* quarrels with nobody in the world."[108] And what is more, it is said that the Buddha's *Dhamma* which is lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the ending, with the spirit and the letter – that is the *Brahma*-faring wholly fulfilled, quite purified.[109]

PEACEFUL WORLD

Peace Towards Human World (*santikamma*)

In spite of all the ostensible differences, the motives behind these actions are the same. All forms of war, conflict, rivalry and quarrel, whether between individuals, groups or nations, whether current or in the distant past, according to the Buddhist thought, it is trace of three categories i.e. greed (*lobha*), hatred (*dosa*) and illusion (*moha*) which is unwholesome 'root' of thought and action. The presence of these three harmful and baneful sources grows in people's wholesome (*kusala*) mental qualities and volitional state, making their behavior a danger to society. With selfish desire for pleasures and acquisitions, it leads to attachment to wealth and desiring for possessions. It's the cause of crime, exploitation, corruption and conflict. This also explains why, while the wealth-creating possibilities of new technology, the gap between the rich and the poor widens, and the polarization of wealth and poverty becomes stronger and sharper. Moreover, craving for sensual enjoyment and sensual indulgence is leading to the squanderers consumption of natural resources and the pollution of the environment, resulting in the depletion of resources, health

problems and aggravation of poverty. With hunger and mass misery prevailing, the risk of war increases and world peace is unrealizable. With craving for dominance and lust for power individuals, parties and nations vie with one another for supremacy. Even in the absence of an open conflict, they live in fear, distrust and anxiety. At national and international levels, this is detrimental to mutual security and development. Political leaders resort to arms as props for political power. It causes all degrees of hostile feeling, from annoyance to most violent extreme of wrath. The erroneous view of things characteristic made the man whose nature is 'unenlightened'. It is regarded as the roots of evil. On the present-day global scene of war and conflict, it is not specifically any one of these three motives that drives people to the battlefield, but rather all three of them combined, and their combination only makes the situation more serious, the problem more complicated and the solution more difficult. Buddhist humanists have been asked themself that how can man stop wars and conflicts and how can man be sure that peace will prevail and endure?

The word 'peace' derived from Latin '*pax*'. In the term *Pāli*, it find from '*santi*' Buddhist humanism advocates any collective or individual endeavor that aims to create an atmosphere of mutual understanding, trust and respect among people, nations and human beings. Buddhism encourages dispelling prejudices, inferiority and superiority complexes, all of which are very harmful to human dignity and human values.

A Buddhist humanist is required would devote his thoughts, words and bodily activities towards bringing about the happiness and welfare of all sentient beings as his own aim and objective. It lays the foundation of peace in the community and world, as was expounded by Buddha "Oh, *Bhikkhu*, you should go forth for the welfare of the many, for

the happiness of the many, out of compassion for the world, for the advantage for the welfare, for the happiness of the deities and human beings Oh *Bhikkhu*, teach the *Dhamma*, that is good at the beginning, good in the middle, good at the end, with meaning and with form. Reveal the holy life that is completely and entirely pure."[110]

A Buddhist humanist who does not put himself into antagonistic relationships with others, nor does him enters into disputes with other people. This explains his balanced and serene attitude, standing above board, leaving behind all victory and defeat "Victory breed hatred, for the conquered is unhappy. He who has given up both victory and defeat, he, the contented, is happy."[111] Buddhist humanism advises that one should make good priority to be victorious over *lobha* (greed), *dosa* (anger) and *moha* (delusion) that are still dormant. It is considers as the most dangerous enemies that not only gives damaged to oneself, but also are the source of the unhappiness and suffering of others. The Buddha says, "No enemy can harm one so much as one's own thoughts of craving, hate and jealousy".[112] Or "One's own self conquered better than all others people, none can undo the victory, who has vanquished himself and always lives under restraint."[113]

The Buddha says in the *Sallekha Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* that it is not possible, one who is stuck in the mud to pull out another who is stuck in the mud. But it is possible for one who is himself not stuck in the mud to pull out another who is stuck in the mud.[114] The important message of the Buddha is that one who suffers from moral depravity, and who are not at peace with themselves are incapable of serving society.

The concept of peace in Buddhist humanism refers to in the four sublime states (*bralımavihāra*) viz. loving-kindness (*mettā*), compassion (*karuṇā*), sympathetic joy (*muditā*) and

equanimity (*upekkhā*).[115] Lord Buddha made it very clear that his purpose in preaching the *Dhamma* was neither to quarrel with other religious leaders nor to compete with any antagonistic doctrine. There was no quarrel in his teachings. He just showed the way out of suffering, the way to enlightenment and to liberation. To those who were beset with anger, he taught *mettā* (loving-kindness) to subdue anger, which is cultivated of the compassionate mind towards all living beings. It is intended to restrain a person from indulging in action, which proceeds from the absence of compassion and insensitivity to the pain of another sentient being. It stands for an attitude of friendliness a loving kindness which is boundless and all encompassing, not limited by the common bonds of attachment familiar in narrowly defined human relationships such as those of family, race religion etc. in fact, that is, when someone attacks or abuses one, truly lasting harm (*himsā*) only arises when one reacts with anger (*dosa*) or violence. An enemy wishes such things, as that one is ugly, in pain, without good fortune, poor, without fame, without friends, and not destined for a heavenly rebirth. Yet allowing one own to be prey to anger brings these very things.[116] Hatred is, according to Buddhist humanism, an unwholesome trait that creates suffering to the person who possesses it as well as to members of the society which he or she inhabits and with whom he or she interacts. According to the Buddha one who sustains a loving-mind even for the duration of a moment does something, which is of great consequence.[117] The Buddhist humanism emphasized the need to conquer hatred through love; it does not advocate the conquest of hatred through hatred. "Hatred can nerve be appeased in this world through hatred. But it is appeased by means of non-hatred. This is an eternal law."[118] The Buddha recommends that a more worthy as well as an efficacious way of winning over persons who are envious, greedy and untruthful is treating them with love,

generosity and truthfulness. Love is considered as an extremely important social virtue that human beings could feel even though they are different in bodies, they are one in mind. Each one in such a community takes care of the other person as if he is his own person.

Equality, brotherhood, understanding respect for life, respect far other's views, respect for other's religions is the foundation of Buddhist humanism that all these have their roots in *mettā* (loving-kindness). The concept loving-kindness of Buddhist humanism can enter deeply into the hearts of people as the basic principles of life. Through the conversion of bodily, vocal and mental activities, these principles are an invincible material force to change world of war and insecurity becoming a world of peace and happiness. In the *Kakacūpaima Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya,* the Buddha teaches that wherefore, even if anyone face to fact with one should speak dispraise of other person or give a blow with the hand to other person or give a blow with his hand, should give a blow with a clod of earth, should give a blow with a stick, should give a blow with a weapon, even so should one, get rid of those desires that are worldly, those thoughts that are worldly; and he should train himself thus: 'Neither will my mind become perverted, nor will I utter an evil speech, but kindly and compassionate will I dwell with a mind of friendliness and void of hatred.' It is thus that one must train himself.[119]

To those who were prone to harmfulness he taught *karuṇā* (compassion) to turn them into harmless ones, which is sympathy that arises in a good person when that person becomes aware of the suffering of others. Buddhaghosa defines "when there is suffering in others it causes good peoples hearts to be moved." "It has the characteristic of devotion to removing the suffering of others."[120] This specific characteristic of peace is not only to minimize attitude to rancour, spite, grudge, but also to improve relation between

man-to-man or nation-to-nation such as with the influence of loving-kindness's and compassion's mind the Buddha tamed the elephant Nālāgiri. Then the Lord, stroking the elephant Nālāgiri's forehead with his right hand, the verses is addressed:

"Do not elephant, strike the elephant (among men), for painful,
elephant, is the striking of the elephant (among men),

For there is no good bourn, elephant, for a slayer of the
elephant (among men) when he is hence beyond.

Be not proud; be not wanton, for the wanton
reach not a good bourn;

Only that should you do by which
you will go to a good bourn."[121]

To those who were not happy over other people's successes, he taught *muditā* (joyfulness) so that they knew how to share their happiness with others one, which is understood as sympathetic joy viz. the ability to feel happy and joyful at the success of another. This is to be cultivated as an antidote to jealousy or envy that prevent informal and friendly atmosphere. To those who were addicted to hatred and enmity, he taught *upekkhā* (equanimity) so as to neutralize their vindictiveness. So he has specific cures for many mental diseases and ills of the world, which is recognized as the most noteworthy psychological factor in the rapturous state of the fourth *jhāna*. The role of *upekkhā* in Buddhist humanism is a path of ultimately transcends wholesome dispositions like love. *Upekkhā* is equanimity, a mental state in which one is unruffled by gaining or loss, fame or inflame, praise or blame etc. *upekkhā* does not amount to a liquidation or denial of love in the wholesome sense in which love is admitted. *Upekkhā* helps a person to love but yet be detached. Buddhist humanism strongly recommends the cultivation of all these four *Brahmavihāra* to become god-like in one's character.

Among the central values of the loving-kind (*mettā*), compassion (*karuṇā*), sympathetic joy (*muditā*) and equanimity (*upekkhā*) Buddhist humanism also mentions to the factors which brings the process of peace as patience, tolerance, humility, contentment, and charity. Patience (*khanti*) is long-suffering, compliance, absence of rudeness and abruptness, complacency of heart.[122] Patience (*khanti*) is a strong armor and a useful instrument in the resistance of mental evils and the attainment of noble objects. Pain, physical or mental, difficulty, sickness and various sorts of obstacles must be borne with unfaltering firmness of the mind that it is said of the strong man. In *Saṁyutta Nikāya*, it cites as following:

"Worsen of the two is he who, when reviled,
Revile again. Who doth not, when reviled,
Revile again, a twofold victory wins.
Both of the other and himself he seeks
The good; for he the other's angry mood,
Doth understand and groweth calm and still."[123]

These similar verses also are found when a *brahmin* heard that his skin, Bhāradvāja had 'left the world to enter the Order of Gotama the Recluse.' He follows the Buddha around and use insults and abuses. He does not seem to take note of His mind by power of patient. After that the Buddha ask him what he does when he prepares food and drinks for visiting relatives, but they decline what he offers: who does the food and drink then belong to? He replies 'those things are for us.' The Buddha then says, 'that with which you revile, abuse and insult, that I who do none of these things and do not accept. So now, *brahmin*, it remains with you.' He then gives the above verses.[124]

Patience is included in the ten perfections of the *Bodhisattva*, which it is regarded as essential to the attainment

outer and inner peace. In *Jātaka* it is said that an ascetic who was put to torture by a king. In spite of such torture administered by way of step-to-step physical pain, augmented psychological pain, the ascetic did not only lose his patience, but also extend compassion towards the king.[125] The Buddha has said, "Whosoever without resentment bears reviling, blows and bonds, who has made patience his strong stay and support him I call a *Brahman*."[126] In *Aṅguttara Nikāya* patience is mentioned as one of the four characteristics of a monk along with rectitude, swiftness in apprehension and tenderness. A monk who is equipped with these four is said to be worthy of worship, offerings and respectful salutation. If one is absence of patient or impatient it would be obstructs for process of peace as the Buddha shows the five disadvantages of being impatient viz. not to many folk is he dear or pleasing; he is hated much; is avoided by many; dies muddled in thought and rises in hell,[127] as well as the five forms of mental bondage regards the lusts, body, form, eating and living the godly life that one not wholly free of passion, nor free of desire, nor free of fondness, nor free of thirst, nor free of fever, nor free of craving, his heart inclines not to ardour, devotion, perseverance, exertion.[128]

The tolerance (*adhivāsanā*) means broadmindedness, open-mindedness, and leniency, which is the different factor of Buddhist humanism to establish peace and harmony among mankind. It is illustrated in many stories of *Nikāya* literature regarding to tolerance such as *Devadatta*, Buddha's own cousin, plotted to cause a schism among the community and his words and actions were not in accordance with Buddha's doctrine. It cannot find any angry words came out of Buddha's mouth at the action of *Devadatta* who looking for killing Him to monopolize the position and power leading the *Saṅgha*.[129]

By the Buddhist monk's advice, the tolerance (*adhivāsanā*) is also seen, in the case of king *Aúoka* who

extended support to all sects alike even the *Ajivikas*, whose doctrines are so often criticized by Buddha as definitely false. Indeed, the tolerance of Buddhist humanism is extended during the historical length of humankind over 2,500 years. The outbreak of wars by serious discord or conflict between nations or religions has never been in the name of Buddhism. In other words, Buddhist humanism conquers heart of man by the concept of tolerance without persecuting or maltreating. In the *Dhammapada* it quotes that 'he abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, and he robbed me' - in those who harbor such thought hatred will never cease, only in those who do not harbor such thought hatred will cease.[130] Further, in the *Sabbāsava Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha advises one should bear with conditions of "cold, heat, hunger, thirst, the touch of gadfly, mosquito, wind and sun, creeping things, ways of speech that are irksome, unwelcome; he is of a character to bear bodily feelings which, arising, are painful, acute, sharp, shooting, disagreeable, miserable, deadly."[131]

Humiliţy (*nihatamāna*) in Buddhist humanism is considered as the concept of peace. It suppresses pride (*māna*), conceit or arrogance as an evil latent bias (*anusaya*), which obstructs a man from seeing the true nature of things.[132] A person who is interested in his spiritual progress has to destroy this tendency in him in order to achieve the ultimate goal[133] . A perfected man is one who has destroyed this latent bias along with the biases of greed, hatred and ignorance.[134] In the *Saṁyutta Nikāya*,[135] the Buddha says that a man becomes conceited or arrogant because of his ignorance through which are harbors ideas of a permanent soul. So to do away with pride and conceit, a true vision of things is essential. A man becomes proud of family, clan, parents, complexion, and wealth etc. But the Buddha says that it is only due to ignorance that a man becomes proud of them. Any of these things is not going to make a person a

noble man. In the *Parābhava Sutta*[136] the Buddha says that people bring about their own downfall by disparaging relatives and other men, being conceited on account of birth, wealth etc.

Thus humility, or absence of pride, is regarded in Buddhist humanism as a virtue in man. A virtuous man should not compare himself with other and harbor ideals such as 'I am inferior to him' or 'I am equal to him'. On the other hand he should be able to appreciate whatever is good in others and cultivate in him good qualities that are lacking in him. It is only a fool who will think that he alone is capable of doing various things and that other should follow his command.[137] A man should be sympathetic kind and friendly in disposition towards all beings.[138] These are the characteristic features of a man of humility. Such a man is loved by all would like to associate him. In the *Brahma-gāla Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya,* the Buddha always warns his disciples: "If outsiders were to speak against me, or against the Doctrine, or against the Order, you should not, on that account, either bear malice, or suffer heart-burning, or fell ill-will If you, on that account, should be angry and hurt, that would stand in the way of your own self-conquest ... would you then be able to judge how far that speech of theirs is well said or ill?"[139] On the other hand, "If outsiders were to speak in praise of me, or in praise of the Doctrine, or in praise of the Order, you should not, on that account, be filled with pleasure or gladness, or be lifted up in heart for it you were to be happy, delighted an debated, it will only be a danger to you "[140] In the *Sampasādaniya Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya,* when Sāriputta, his own disciple, says in praise of him: "I have such faith in the Exalted One that I do not think that there ever has been, nor will there ever be a recluse or Brahmin who has greater understanding and knowledge than the Exalted One," (*evam pasanno aham bhante Bhagavati, na cāhu na ca bhavissati na c'etarahi vijjati aññο samaṇo vā*

brāhmaṇo vā bhiyyo'bhiññātaro)[141] the Buddha quietly rebukes him with the remark, "have you examined the minds of the perfectly enlightened Exalted Ones of the past the future or my own mind in the present" (*kin nu ye te ahesuṃ atītam addhānaṃ arahanto Sammāsambuddhā, sabbe te Bhagavanto cetasā ceto paricca viditā kimpana aham te etarahi cetasā ceto paricca vidito*).[142] To this Sāriputta replies, he has not. The Buddha thereupon remarks, "then why have you uttered a statement so grand, bold, made a categorical claim and uttered a lion's roar to the effect that 'I have such faith '" (*a tha kiñ carahi te ayam ulārā āsabhī vācā bhāsitā, ekamso gahito, sīhanādo nadito, evam pasanno aham*).[143] This incident displays the basically objective attitude of the Buddha, who demanded that for statements to be significant and true, they must be based on evidence that warrants their assertion and not on the grounds of our subjective prejudices.

Contentment (*santuṭṭhi*) is the mental condition of a person who is satisfied with what he possesses or the position in which he finds himself (*santussamāno itarītarena*).[144] The destruction of covetousness, therefore, is essential to the happiness of mankind. A monk asks Buddha, 'who will be satisfied in this world'? Buddha says, "One who lives a holy life in respect of sensual pleasures and one who is free from desires and mindful."[145] Absence of contentment leads to the arising of much psychological defilement such as jealousy, hatred, pride, hypocrisy and various other vices. The Buddha says that man's mind out control, become one domed to suffer in hell, in perdition by eight wrong states of contentment as gain, loss, fame, obscurity, honor, lack of honor, evil intentions, and evil friendship.[146] The state of peace is quite reasonable that contentment which regards as the avoidance from an abominable vice and covetousness. The mind of covetousness is always conducts to lose balance in life of man, which covets delicacies, does not take delight in meditation. Buddha says about self-controlled life whether

monk or layman, true contentment is praised as a virtue of the wise.[147]

Charity (*caga*) is considered in the meaning toward off pain and suffering from other beings. It strove to make society happy by the mutual sympathy, compassion, and kindness of human beings such as in the *Mahāsīhanāda Sutta* the Buddha said that there was set up in him kindness even towards a drop of water,[148] and he thought: 'Do not let me bring small creatures in their various place to destruction.'[149] Charity also is found in immaterial deed when Buddha visited monk's cells with his favorite disciple *Ānanda*. He saw a sick monk lying on a soiled bed without any attendant. Buddha washed him with the help of *Ānanda*. Then he assembles his disciples and told them that they should attend one another in sickness. He said anyone who wishes to attend Buddha should attend a sick man. [150]

The term Altruism (parahitakāmatā) is considered as a part of proceeding to peace towards human world. It regards to the desire making the good or welfare of others. In Nikāya, it is said that the present of Buddha as "A being not liable to delusion has arisen in the world for the welfare of the many folk, for the happiness of many folk, out of compassion fort the world, for the good, the welfare, the happiness of *devas* and men"[151] or "for the benefit, welfare and salvation of gods and men."[152] *Dhammapada* also cites, "For the sake of others' welfare, however great, let not one neglect one's own welfare. Clearly perceiving one's own welfare let one he intent on one's own goal."[153]

Peace in Mental Calm (*santivāda*)

Buddhist humanism states that if hatred, greed and delusion, the roots of all evil forces in person's mind are not yet extinct, then how can world peace be possible? To obtain peace, mankind can eradicate these evil forces. The world

cannot have peace until men and nations renounce selfish desires, give up racial arrogance, and eradicate egoistic lust for possession and power. Wealth cannot secure happiness. Religion alone can effect the necessary change of heart and bring about the only real disarmament - that of the mind. In the discourse of *Aṅguttara Nikāya* the Buddha shows the six factors viz. amity; pity; sympathy joy; poise; the signless; and the complete rooting out of the conceit 'I am', that one have made mind-emancipation, made an increase of it, made a vehicle of it, made a home of it, dwelt with it, gathered it together, set it well going, one's heart and stay is not invades by ill-will, fell thoughts, enmity, passion, all signs, and the dart of doubt and questioning.[154]

On several occasion accounts of Buddha's life, he had to fight against *Māra* that incarnates the evil side of human nature. *Māra* is also known in different name of *akusala-citta* (immoral consciousness) and *akusala-cetasika* (immoral psychic factor of consciousness), which belong to micro-fetters. These micro-fetters are latent deeply in consciousness and psychic factor of consciousness, which underlies of the names as *rāga* (lust), *dosa* (hatred), *moha* (delusion), *ahirika* (shamelessness), *anottappa* (restlessness) and *uddhacca* (distraction). In the *Dvedhāvitakka Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha says, "The man not desiring their good, not desiring their weal, not desiring their security from bonds, this is a synonym for Māra, the Evil One."[155]

In the process of ardent meditation (at high state of consciousness), one is the face to face with *Māra* in the fight. In other words, he strikes himself to happenings of consciousness and controls to resist temptation of sensuous desires, malice, bewilderment, shamelessness, restlessness and distraction. He always thinks to himself, 'Now I live keeping myself free from fear and can no more be affected by *Māra*.'[156] In the *Dhammapada* also cites, "The wise that

control their body, who control their tongue, the wise that control their mind, are indeed well controlled."[157]

" He cleaveth not to sensuous-desires,
Cool all his being, rid of all the germs,
That brings new life, all cumbrances cut out,
Subbued the pain and pining of the heart,
Calm and serene, he resetth happily,
For in his mind he hath attained to peace."[158]

Through the story of Vepacitti, lord of the *Asuras*,[159] the Buddha says that one who hath conceits (*maññamāna*),[160] something moved (*iñjita*), something wavering (*phandita*), obsession (*papañcita*) and vain imagining (*gilipapañ-cena*) is *Māra*'s bondsman. One who hath no conceits vain imagining is freed from the Evil One. The concepts of 'I am,' 'this am I,' 'I shall be,' 'I shall not be,' 'embodied shall I be,' 'disembodied shall I be, ' 'I shall be conscious,' 'unconscious shall I be,' 'neither conscious nor unconscious shall I be' are an imposthume, a barb. Wherefore one should trains and abides with heart free from conceits, with heart immovable, unwavering, un-obsessed, and with heart that has slain conceit.[161] Or in the *Dhātuvibhaṅga Sutta* the Buddha teaches his disciples, "Monk, when it is said, 'Where there is stability, conceit and boasting do not continue in existence, and when they do not continue in existence the sage is said to be at peace,' in reference to what is it said? 'I am,' monk, this is a supposition. 'This am I' I will be' 'I will not be' 'I will be possessed of form' 'I will be incorporeal' 'I will be possessed of perception' 'I will not be possessed of perception' 'I will be possessed of neither perception nor non-perception,' this supposition. A supposition, monk, is an ill, a supposition is an imposthume, a supposition is a barb. Monk, when he has gone beyond all suppositions the sage is said to be at peace. But, monk, a sage who is at peace is not born, does not age, is not agitated, does not envy."[162]

The Buddha says to his disciples in *Saṁyutta Nikāya* that if man detaches five aggregates as no self or egolessness *Māra* (Evil One) cannot find anyone as of his slave.

"The body's shape, all that we feel, perceive,
And know by sense, and whatso will hath planned:
This congeries – whoso doth know it well;
That 't is not I, that 't is not Mine – he thus
Breaks from its charm. Him thus dispassionate,
The self at peace, all fetters left behind,
Him, though they hunting seek in every sphere
Of life, the hosts Māra ne'er will find."[163]

In the *Nivāpa Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha says that man should make a lair where *Māra* and *Māra*'s companions do not come; having made that lair, one can eat fodder not encroaching entranced on that crop sown by *Māra* – material things of the world, so one will not get elated, not get careless, not become those to be done to by *Māra* as he wills amid that crop - material things of the world.[164] Therefore, it is said that one who frees from *Māra* or who attains highest state of peace.

"Freed am I from all snares that do beset,
Snares of delights terrestrial or divine
From mighty bondage have I freedom won.
Thou thing of ends, confess thyself laid low."[165]

Unfortunately, the development of inner mind and spiritual values, not kept pace with the rapid progress of technology. Though technical science developed a very high degree, one has still not developed the qualities needed to live and deal with himself, with others and with his nature and environment. That also mainly factor, which the Buddha didn't encourage his followers studying or perform

supernatural power (*iddhi-pāṭihāriya*).[166] If they attain supernatural power with unwholesome mind, just could grow their pride and evil. So, the Buddha persuades them previous the way purging the defilements of mind. This secure way will bring to the benefit for their individual. As well as, if authorities or powers drop into the hand of an individual, a group or national leader, worldly leader who abound with the mind of defilements, those would be the calamity of world and humankind. However, Buddhist humanism also welcomes to the achievements of scientific and technological advances that if it attended to benefic of people. It is said in *Pāli Nikāya* the Buddha admitted his disciples who attaining *Arahantship* (saint-ship) uses the miracle for purpose due to benefic of humankind. He have been praised Mahā-Moggallāna[167] as who of supernormal powers in *Bhikkhu*-community and Uppalavaṇṇā[168] as who of supernormal powers in *Bhikkhunī*-community. The scientific and technological advances have been the hope and dream of man that one will be in possession of all that one want and in control of everything. It is said that one seems to be equipped with all that one need to bring about the peaceful and happy process for humankind.

In the *Sakka-pañha Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, Sakkha, the ruler of the gods, asked the question to the Buddha that why people who want to live in peace, who aspire for amity – nevertheless live in enmity, hating, injuring, hostile, malign. The answer given by the Buddha dug to root cause from envy and selfishness (*issā-macchariya*); from things as dear and not dear to man; from desire (*chanda*); from mental pre-occupation (*vitakka*); from obsession (*papañca-saññā*).[169] For pursuing peace and amity according to the Buddha the path suitable for and leading to the cessation of this cause is that one should followed after *Dhammas* of happiness, sorrow and equanimity that bad qualities were diminished and good qualities developed; and should avoid *Dhammas* of

happiness, sorrow and equanimity that bad qualities developed and good qualities were diminished. In the *Sallekha Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya*, the Buddha's advice says that the arising of thought is very helpful in regard to skilled states (of mind), not to speak of gesture and speech that are in conformity (with thought). Therefore, the thought should arise: 'Others may be harmful; we, as to this, will not be harmful.' The thought should arise: 'Others may be those who make onslaught on creatures; we, as to this, will be those who are restrained from making onslaught on creatures Other may seize the temporal we, as to this, will not seize the temporal, not grasping it tightly, letting go of it easily.'[170]

In the *Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha points out seven conditions of welfare should exercises in higher wisdom as mental activity, search after truth, energy, joy, peace, earnest contemplation, and equanimity of mind that one will be full of faith, modest in heart, afraid of wrong doing, full of learning, strong in energy, active in mind and full of wisdom; as well as one may be expected not to decline, but to prosper.[171] Further, one will exercises themselves in the realization of the ideas of impermanency of all phenomena, bodily or mental, the absence of any 'soul' of corruption, of the danger of wrong thoughts, of the necessity of getting rid of them, of purity of heart of *Nibbāna*.[172]

Once addressed a monk called Cunda, in the *Sallekha Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya*, Buddha saying, "It is not possible Cunda, for him who is stuck in the mud to pull out another who is stuck in the mud. But Cunda, it is possible for one who is himself not stuck in mud to pull out another who is stuck in the mud."[173] Therefore, Buddhist humanism emphasizes the special importance to build world peace of mind as in *Naḷakapāna Sutta* the Buddha teaches that one should aloof from pleasures of the senses, aloof from unskilled states of mind, if he does not win joy and happiness

or something more peaceful than that, then coveting persists in obsessing his mind, and malevolence persist in obsessing his mind, and sloth and torpor and restlessness and worry and doubt and discontent and apathy persists in obsessing his mind.[174] In fact that if one who is deprived of inner peace will not be able to propagate peace in society. By developing peace in his mind, one will very easily avoid all conflicting situations and pave the path for peaceful co-existence. It is only by developing one's own mind to such an extent where peace and tranquility reign supreme that a person can think of fostering peace in every sphere of social activity. "Whether man stands, walks, sits or lies down, as long as one is awake, one should develop mindfulness. This is the noblest living here."[175] The noblest living is described by the Buddha in the place of tranquility (*santipada*), "Let not an eminent man (*nāga*) dispute after having embraced those (views) separated from which he (formerly) wandered in the world; as the thorny lotus (*elambuga*) is undefiled by water and mud, so the recluse, the confessor of peace, free from greed, does not cling to sensual pleasures and the world."[176] This tranquil state is also known as the highest blessing of *Nibbāna*:

"Knowing the subtlety of form and knowing
How feelings come to be, and whence arises
Perception, how it ends, knowing th' activities
As other and as ill, but not as self;
(There things) if he do see aright, the monk,
At peace, delighting in the place of peace
Beareth the final body (in the world)
For he hath conquered Māra and his mount."[177]

In brief, the attitude to peace in Buddhist humanism is an important part as the solution to man's conflict that not only conducts to welfare for an individual, but also brings harmony for society. Until this fact is not fully understood,

man's life and existence will remain imperfect and faulty. The path escaping from disasters of Buddhist humanism is based on the non-injury (*ahiṁsā*), loving-kind (*mettā*), compassion (*karuṇa*) and understanding (*vijānāti*) as Dalai Lama XIV of Tibet writes, "The key to creating a better and more peaceful world is the development of love and compassion for other"[178] Jayatilleke also states, "Buddhism holds that although sanctions have a place in law, the law itself is based on consent resulting from understanding, friendliness and mutual interest."[179]

Buddhist humanism exhorts that 'to protect peace is to protect life.' It is against all expansionist wars, which always include annexation of territory and wealth and interference into the internal affairs of other countries and nations. The Buddha always calls upon that one should live friendly amongst the hostile, peaceful amongst the violent, unattached amongst the attached.[180] Furthermore, the attainment of inner peace through the eradication of the unwholesome psychological traits is considered as supreme value of peace.

References

1. E. O. B., Vol. I, Fascicle 1, ed. by G. P. Malalasekera, s.v. *Ahiṁsā*.
2. Chāndgya Upanishad, III, p. 17.
3. S. I, p. 164.
4. E.O.B. Vol. II, Fascicle 3, s.v. *Avihiṁsā*.
5. M. III, pp. 250-251.
6. Sn. v. 393.
7. DhsA. p.129.
8. DhsA. p.129.
9. A. III, p. 204.
10. A. IV, p. 151.
11. Sidgwick, H., *'The Method of Ethics'*, London (1874), p. 239.
12. See D. I, p. 79.
13. D. I, pp. 142-143,165; Sn. v. 307 ff.
14. D. I, p. 12; DA. I, p. 97.

15. A. II, p. 176.
16. D. II, pp. 352-353.
17. A. IV, pp. 42-43.
18. Vin. IV, p. 33.
19. Sn. vv. 294-295.
20. M. I, pp.78-79.
21. Kh. VII, pp. 202-203; IX, pp.231-232; cf. Ud. pp. 25, 59.
22. D. I, p. 46.
23. Damien V. Keown, Charles S. Prebish, Wayne R. Husted (Ed.), *'Buddhism and Human Rights'*, Curzon Press (1998), p. x.
24. Vin. IV, pp. 218-219. Cf. the ten beings forbidding to be eaten (man, elephant, horse, dog, snake, lion, tiger, leopard, bear, hyena) in SBE. xvii, p. 85.
25. M. I, p. 368-369.
26. M. I, p. 370-371.
27. A. III, p. 383.
28. Kh. VII, pp. 210-211.
29. Dhp. v. 1.
30. D. III, p. 150.
31. S. V, p. 354.
32. Dhp. v. 129.
33. Dhp. v. 130.
34. D. I, p. 63; Dial. I, p. 79.
35. J. V, pp. 412-414; see MA. II, p.783; DhpA. III, pp. 254-256.
36. J. II, pp. 400-403; cf. J. I, pp. 261-268.
37. Dhp. v. 223.
38. Dhp. v. 103.
39. Walpola Rahula, *"Zen and the taming of the bull: Essays"*, Gordon Fraser (1978), p. 117.
40. Vism. p. 300.
41. D. I, p. 4.
42. A. I, p. 101: M. III, p. 61.
43. J. VI, p. 236.
44. Kh. V, p. 128.
45. Walpola Rahula, *"What the Buddha Taught"*, 2nd ed., Gordon Fraser (1967), p. 84.
46. S. I, pp. 82-83.
47. Dhp. v. 201.
48. A. I, p. 83.

49. D. I, pp. 62-63.
50. A. III, pp. 207-208.
51. S. IV, p. 308.
52. S. IV, p. 309.
53. Thera. V, p. 75.
54. Sn. vv. 115-117.
55. D. I, pp. 7, 178.
56. Sn. v. 148 ff
57. Sn. vv. 145-147.
58. M. II, pp. 98-100.
59. Dhp. v. 405.
60. DA. I, p. 86.
61. Malalasekera G.P., '*Philosophical Implications of the Pañcasīla*', Sambhāshā (1991), p. 269.
62. D. III, p. 61.
63. Radhgovinda Basak, '*Asoka Inscriptions*', p. 71.
64. E.O.B., Vol. I, Fascicle 1, s.v. *Ahiṁsā*.
65. Nandasena Ratnapala, '*Buddhist Sociology*', Delhi (1993), p. 167.
66. M. I, pp. 84-87.
67. M. I, pp. 364-367.
68. D. III. 234; A. IV. 456; Sn. 863, 928
69. D. II, p. 66 ff.
70. M. I, p. 53 f.
71. A. I, p. 176; D. II, p. 63.
72. M. I, pp. 185-189.
73. S. III, p. 24.
74. S. V, p. 85.
75. S. V, p. 141.
76. M. I, p. 257.
77. M. I, p. 259.
78. S. III, p. 103
79. S. III, p. 25 f.
80. Keith, '*Buddhist Philosophy*', p. 82.
81. Sn. v. 757
82. A. V, p. 313.
83. Cf. S. III, p. 47.
84. A. I, pp. 201-202.
85. D. III, p. 182.
86. M. I, p. 511.

87. Sn. v. 916.
88. S. II, p. 253.
89. D. II, p. 93; A. III, p. 211; IV, p. 405 ff.
90. Dhp. v. 379.
91. Dalai Lama, H.H.XIV, *"Universal responsibility and the good heart"*, Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan works (1976), pp. 29.
92. Dalai Lama, H.H.XIV, *"Universal responsibility and the good heart"*, Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan works (1976), pp. 10.
93. M. II, pp. 245-246.
94. M. I, p. 207.
95. Iti. p. 12.
96. Sn. v. 450.
97. M. II, pp. 247-250.
98. M. I, p. 322; II, pp. 250-251; cf. D. III, pp. 245-246; cf. A. III, p. 289.
99. D. III, p. 152; A. II, pp. 32, 248; cf. J. V, p. 330.
100. A. III, p. 172.
101. A. III, p. 38.
102. D. III, p. 61.
103. M. I, p. 345.
104. M. I, pp. 179-180.
105. M. I, p. 288.
106. D. III, p. 263.
107. M. I, pp. 108-109.
108. S. III, p. 165.
109. M. I, p. 179.
110. S. I, p. 105.
111. Dhp. v. 201.
112. Dhp. v. 42.
113. Dhp. v. 104.
114. M. I., p. 45.
115. D. III, pp. 196, 220.
116. A. IV, p. 94.
117. A. I, p. 113.
118. Dhp. v. 5.
119. M. I, pp. 123-124.
120. Vims. I, p. 318.
121. Vin. V, p. 194.
122. Dhs. part 1341.
123. S. I, p.222.

124. See S.I, p.162.
125. J. p. 313.
126. Dhp. v. 399.
127. A. III, p. 253.
128. A. III, p. 249.
129. Miln. p. 248 f.; Vin. III, p. 245; cf. DhpA. II, p. 164.
130. Dhp.vv. 3-4.
131. M. I, p. 10.
132. M. I, p. 486; D. III, p. 254.
133. D. III, p. 282.
134. Sn. vv. 370, 469, 786.
135. S. IV, p. 203.
136. Sn. v. 104
137. Dhp. v, 74.
138. D. I, p. 4, 63, 171.
139. D. I, pp. 2-3.
140. D. I, p. 3; cf. M. I, p. 140.
141. D. I, p. 99.
142. D. III, p. 100.
143. D. III, p. 100.
144. Sn. v. 42.
145. Sn. v. 1039.
146. A. IV, p. 159.
147. Dhp.v. 362.
148. According to the scientists, there are innumerable bacteria in a drop of water.
149. M. I, p. 78.
150. Sn. vv. 258-269; J. p. 453.
151. M. I, p. 83.
152. M. I, p. 210.
153. Dhp.v. 166.
154. A. III, pp. 290-292.
155. M. I, p. 118.
156. Kern, H., '*Manual of Indian Buddhism*', Strassburg (1896), p. 42.
157. Dhp.v. 234.
158. S. I, p. 273.
159. One of six realms (Heavens, Human, Asuras, Pretas, Animal and Hells) is mentioned in Buddhism.
160. According to Comy. *Taṇhā-diṭṭhi-māna*, there are four kinds of conceit namely, craving (*taṇhā*), view (*diṭṭhi*), eternalist view

(*sassata-diṭṭhi*), and the annihilationist view (*uccheda-diṭṭhi*).

161. S. IV, p. 202.
162. M. III, p. 246.
163. S. I, p. 112.
164. M. I, p. 158-159.
165. S. I, p. 105.
166. Vin. II, p. 112.
167. A. I, p. 23.
168. A. I, p. 24.
169. D. II, pp. 276-277.
170. M. I, p. 43.
171. D. II, p. 79.
172. D. II, p. 80.
173. M. I, p. 45.
174. M. II, pp. 463-464.
175. Sn. vv. 150 ff.
176. Sn. v. 845.
177. A. II. p.17.
178. Dalai Lama H.H.XIV, '*Non-governmental Organizations United Nations World Conference on Human Rights*', the lecture in 15 June 1993 Vienna, Austria.
179. Jayatilleke K.N., '*Dhamma, Man and Law*', Singapore (1992), p. 60.
180. Dhp. v. 406.

7

Conclusion

ULTIMATE GOAL

One should not accept authority, revelation and metaphysical speculations that it is no room for the practical realities of life. One should reject the hereditary priest-hood (the view of *brahmin*), the mysticism, animism, asceticism and ceremonialism that it had no place for benefit of life. In other words, it is possible that human beings are endowed with a power or potentiality which the accomplishment of Buddhahood. The reason that man is unable to attain Buddhahood is attributed to man's potentiality being covered up by defilements. If man can eradicate the barrier of defilements, which obstructs the attainment of Buddhahood, one will be Awakened One with highest knowledge. Therefore, many place of *Pāli Nikāya* the Buddha mentions, "live ye as islands unto yourselves, as refuges unto yourselves, taking no other as your refuge; live with the doctrine (the norm) as your island and with the norm as your refuge, taking no other as your refuge."[1]

Based on perception (*paccakkha*) and inference (*anumāna*) among of the six sources of knowledge[2] of the philosophical systems in India i.e. perception (*paccakkha*), inference (*anumāna*), authority or testimony (*sakkhi*), comparison (*upamāna*), postulation (*arthapatti*) and non-perception (*anupalabdhi*) Buddhist humanism lifts up the curtain of mysteries. However, the source of perception (*paccakkha*) is

not only sensory perception but also extra sensory perception, i.e. *iddhividha* (psychic powers), *dibbasota* (clairaudience), *cetopariyañāṇa* (telepathic knowledge), *pubbenivāsānussati* (retro-cognition knowledge), *dibbacakkhu* (clairvoyance or divine ear), and *āsavakkāya* (knowledge of the destruction of defilements).[3] The six extra sensory perception of *abhiññā* (special knowledge) is to become more importance in the process of recognition and attaining emancipated knowledge. It clearly leaves no room for any mysterious objects to be apprehended by an extraordinary intuition. These super-cognitive powers are valued merely because they are believed to augment factual knowledge of the world, which is ordinarily restricted due to certain natural limitations in human sensory capacities. However, Buddhist humanism does not consider these cognitive powers as essentially competent of leading to infallible truths about the nature of existence. Some recluses and *brahmins* who possessed these powers are said to have reached erroneous conclusions about the nature of reality on the basis the data of such super- cognitive experience.

Buddhist humanism also emphasizes the knowledge of intuition (*pariññā*) having from the comprehensive understanding of the nature of things. The similar as *paññā* (the knowledge of spiritual perfection) it is the emancipating knowledge, which is insightful and goal-directed, culminating in the destruction of the cankers that leading to free from all *dukkha* (suffering). It is said, "When one dwells with one's mind obsessed with and given to passion and one does not truly know and see the elimination of the passion that has arisen, it is a cause of one's failure to know and see (likewise) ill-will, sloth and torpor, excitement and perplexity, and doubt (are causes of one's failure to know and see."[4] These five factors are known in the *Pāli Nikāyas* as 'defilements of the mind and factors which weaken wisdom. When the mind is emancipated from these five defilements,

it is supple, pliant, lustrous, firm and becomes rightly concentrated for the destruction of the defiling impulses.'[5] In this state it is said that 'he directs his mind to those things which have to be realized by one's higher knowledge in order to realize them by one's higher knowledge' (*abhiññā-sacchikiriyāya*, loc. cit.). It is not a contradictory attitude when the statement is made clear that "the Exalted One had declared that there is no salvation from belief, hearing (or learning) or intuitive knowledge nor does he say that it is possible by the absence of belief, hearing (or learning) or intuitive knowledge."[6]

In Buddhist humanism it is absent of the thoughts of authority, revelation and metaphysical speculations that it is examined on the scientist attitude by the wise. That is why in *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha says, "Let an intelligent person come to me, sincere, honest and straightforward; I shall instruct him and teach the doctrine so that on my instructions he would conduct himself in such a way that before long he would himself know and himself see "[7] "bearing fruit in this life before long, an invitation to 'come and see', leading to the goal and verifiable by the wise."[8]

The knowledge of Buddhist humanism is just against Externalism (*sassatvāda*), which is misconception of the nature of empirical world. On the other hand it rejects the other extreme, which was presented by materialists, the Annihilationism (*ucchadavāda*). The repudiation of both this extreme finds in the following words of the Buddha: "This world, O Kaccāyana generally proceeds on a duality of the 'it is' and 'it is not'. But whoever perceives in truth and wisdom how things originate in the world, for him there is no 'it is not'. Whoever perceives in truth and wisdom how things pass away in the world for him there is no 'it is' in this world."[9] Buddhist humanism said everything is arising from conditional causation in the domination of process cause and effect. The Buddha used the word '*nadisotoviya*'

(flowing stream) to express a flux of cause and effect that is constantly changing. It flows so continuously that man finds it hard to perceive a break.

Cultivation of right knowledge or the right view is the reality that related to human life. A proper understanding of the phenomenon of suffering involves, as already stated, the comprehension of the facts of impermanence (*anicca*) and of non-substantial (*anattā*) of things. Buddhist humanism declares that there are no real objects to be found anywhere in the component of five aggregations (*khandhas*), namely, physical form (*rūpa*), feelings (*vedanā*), perceptions (*saññā*), mental formations (*sankhāra*) and consciousness (*viññāṇa*) as a chariot is reducible, without remainder, into its component parts, viz. the poles, the axle, the wheels, framework, flag staff, yoke, reins and goad. This is the burden of the celebrated dialogue between the Ven. Nāgasena, and King Milinda.[10] Based on observation, investigation and analysis of empirical data the process of 'flux' of world is recognized as the natural norms of existence based on the concept of consciousness (*citta*), factor of consciousness (*cetasika*) and form (*rūpa*) when there are the right conditions - they are conditioned *Dhammas* (*sankhāra dhammas*) that leading to birth (*jāti*), decay or growing old (*jarā*), disease (*vyādhi*), death (*maraṇa*), sorrow (*soka*), lamentation (*parideva*), pain (*dukkha*), grief (*domanassa*). Everything, which arises because of conditions, has to fall away again when the conditions have ceased – they are an unconditioned reality or unconditioned *Dhammas* (*asankhāra dhammas*) that leading to state of highest happiness (*parama-sukha*).

Like Existentialism, Buddhist humanism set forth that the reality of suffering is the essence nature of the world and man in conditioned *Dhammas* (*sankhāra dhammas*). Due to perversion of ignorance, one sees things, which are by nature impermanent as permanent, and things, which are unsatisfactory (*dukkha*) as satisfactory (*sukha*) and things,

which are devoid of an enduring no-self (*anattā*) as having an enduring self (*attā*).[11] His view being veiled by ignorance he craves for things he likes and hates things he dislikes. Foolishly expecting happiness to be everlasting he gets totally engrossed in enjoyment (*assāda*) of sensual pleasures. He, however, when faced with the evil consequences (*ādīnava*) that go contrary to his desires, experiences *dukkha* (suffering). His mind is defiled by egoistic terms in the certain of ignorance. In a process the nature of world the law of impermanence (*anicca*) possesses almost in every component of thing.

To confront the reality of suffering man is directed towards the cessation of craving, the ending ignorance that is beyond the transitory, changing and perishing of human existence for enlightenment. In other words, Buddhist humanism motivates man to the perfect perception on impermanence (*anicca*) of one's body and mental functions; on subject of conflict (*dukkha*) contemplates the kind of ill of body or mental pain; the world a kingdom of enlightenment.

The caste system is not the room in Buddhist humanism that it has proved an obstacle to the growth of solidarity and brotherhood in the society, of national unity, the member belonging to a caste carry caste feelings and manifest blind and over-riding loyalty to their caste, but ignoring the healthy social standards of justice, fair play, equity and brotherhood, they do not hesitate in harming the interests of members of other castes; it denies equal rights to all irrespective of their caste, creed or color, social barriers are erected specially in the way of lower class individuals who are not given freedom for the mental and physical development and are not provided with opportunities.[12] It often results in putting man on wrong occupation that he cannot take up any other profession even though he may possess the skill and liking for that; it does not utilize fully the talents and capabilities

of the population and is, therefore, a barriers to optimum productivity.

It is clearly how is the importance to demolish the solid wall of caste system survived long time in human consciousness. To rejects the any distinct view imposing on man's existing by birth, sex or social position, Buddhist humanism looks upon man as quite competent in the task of ensuring for himself and his fellow beings success and happiness in this world and in securing for himself his own ultimate emancipation from the turmoil of existence. Buddhist humanism went to the very root of the matter and revealed the character of its foundation to prove all people are equal in the Right of free will and effort through the field of deed, speech and thought which is necessary condition to limit several evils and the individual can change his fate. And it is only human conduct that makes him noble or ignoble.

It upholds the crucial thought that every human being is born with complete freedom and responsibility. It is said in the *Devadaha Sutta*[13] of *Majjhima Nikāya* that Buddhist humanism rejected wrong conceptions as all human present experiences of pleasure and pain are entirely due to past actions (*pubbekatakammahetu*); all human experiences are due to creation by God (*issaranimmanahetu*); beings are destined by experience pleasure and pain due to fate (*saṅghatibhāvahetu*); and all view of experiences are due to hereditary physiological causes (*abhijātihetu*). In *Dīgha Nikāya*, it not accepts theory of Determinism (*ahetuappaccayavāda*)[14] credited that the experience pleasure and pain of being had no initiative; the person is devoid of free-will, effort, will-power, dignity, self-determination or effort of their own. They are going on through a process natural evolution, according to a fixed determination (external) law. It also repudiates the theory of Annihilation which denied moral causation altogether.[15] Another refutation is Accidentalism

(*adhicca-samuppannavāda*) which denies causation altogether and maintains that events take place fortuitously. Naturalism (*sabhāvavada*) belonged to the materialists, which controls everything animate and inanimate in the world, 'man is what he is comprised of was their concept of man, what he does or does not it is his nature,' which is impossible to change.

What is claimed in Buddhist humanism that is the theory of Causally Conditioned free-will of man (*attakara*). Emphasizing the potentiality of man, in a situation where the secondary conditions are desirable, to select the best alternative from several others. The Buddha accepted the probability of everyone in society to refrain from unwholesome acts and to engage in wholesome acts. In the *Sampasādaniya Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* the Buddha thoroughly stressed, " There is personal endeavor (*attakāra*) human effort (*purisakāra*) human strength (*purisathāma*) human energy (*purisaviriya*) human valor (*purisa- parakkama*) and responsibility (*purisadhuraggeha*)."[16]

Buddhist humanism provided ideas for social base through dialectical thought and spiritual relationship, to participate in a spiritual fraternity, believing that "man is not fundamentally a material being driven by the instincts of production and reproduction."[17] The social structure of Buddhist humanism brings harmony for individual and society through the door of wisdom (*paññā*) and loving-kindness (*mettā*). It stressed liberty, equality justice, fraternity for the amelioration of the oppression, it allowed tolerance and freedom of thought and expressing, it disseminated a seed of love and intelligence in one's mind by going beyond the narrow limits of caste, community and nationalities.

The ethic of Buddhist humanism do not base on the theistic point of view which may be illustrated by a statement such as "He is the Great *Brahmā*, the Supreme, the Omnipotent (*abhibhū anabhibhūto*), the Omniscient

(*aññadatthudaso*), the Ruler (*vasavatti*), the Lord (*issaro*), the Maker (*kattā*), the Creator (*nimmāta*) the Father (*pittā*) of all that are and are to be. All beings are His creation... and at His Will all beings come into existence,"[18] and such as "whatsoever happiness or suffering (*sukham vā dukkhaṃvā*) or the state of neither suffering nor happiness mankind (*purisa-puggalo*) experiences, all that is due to the creation of the Lord."[19] For the view of Fatalism (*saṃsāra-suddhivāda*), Non-causationalism (*ahetukavāda*), and Non-actionalism (*akiriyavāda*), human beings cannot help himself that there is neither cause nor condition for the depravity or the rectitude of human beings; the attainment of any given condition, of any character, does not depend on human act, will to act and effort; man is devoid of individual action, of human potentiality, of human power, endeavor, strength and effort (*natthi attakaaro natthi purisakāro, natthi balaṃ, viriyaṃ, purisaparakkamo*). It is different from the term ethic in Christian thought that it is not of the ideal human inter-relations, but of the conformity of the individual to a divine standard. God as absolute moral perfection is the ideal of righteousness.

It is obviously that the results of human purity in Buddhist humanism do not spring from cling to various vows and rituals (*silabbata-parāmāsa*), bathing in sacred rivers, keeping to rituals of fasting, adhering to various kinds of taboos in connected with food, going about naked, wearing one's hair in a particular way or dressing oneself in a specified manner, or sacrificial rites in the forest praying to superhuman deities. Man is only purified by his own fate and destiny that depending upon his own deeds under his own responsibility. *Dhammapada* says, "By oneself, indeed, is evil done; by oneself is one defiled. One leaves evil undone; indeed, oneself purifies one. Purity and impurity depend on oneself. No one purifies another."[20]

An examination in several variant forms of psychological disposition it shows that the moral source of Buddhist humanism is established to limit the cankers of mind. The basic unwholesome dispositions (*akusala*) are sometimes enumerated as varieties of *āsava* (influxes or cankers) and *anusaya* (dormant evil tendencies of the mind). *Asava* (influxes or cankers) includes of four kinds viz. sensuality (*kām-*), rebirth (*bhav-*), speculation (*diṭṭh-*), ignorance (*avijj-āsavas*).[21] It also explains detail *dasa-kilesa-vatthūni* (ten defilement of mind) viz. *lobha* (greed), *dosa* (hate), *moha* (dullness), *māna* (conceit), *diṭṭhi* (speculative opinion), *vicikicchā* (perplexity), *thīna* (stolidity), *uddhaca* (distraction), *ahirika* (un-conscientiousness), and *anottappa* (disregard of blame).[22] *Anusaya* (dormant evil tendencies of the mind) consists of obstinacy, prejudice, bias (*adhiṭṭhānābhinivesānusayā*)[23] ignorance (*avijjā*) lust (*moha*) and hated (*dosa*),[24] delusion, and craving for rebirth.[25] It is firmly convinced that if man acts on any of these unwholesome root of influxes or cankers (*āsava*) and dormant evil tendencies of the mind (*anusaya*), he cannot be on good terms with another one and will only hurt others and cause anger and resentment. When man desires pleasures of sense countered, challenged or defied, he falls prey to anger and hatred, and they lead only to hostility and conflict, not love, cooperation or peace.

Toward solutions to social problems by creating a sense of harmony and mutual kindness, man are encouraged to look on each other as friends and relatives, and equality and liberty will strike a natural balance. It would be not so easy to instill a sense of fraternity, equality and liberty, if the man's mind is remained many obstacles, such as to race and color, intellectual and cultural arrogance, and attachment to personal beliefs and social preferences. The real solution must be made before the conflict starts. More specifically, there must be a fundamental change in behavior and mind

of man, so that man wills no more engage in conflict. To get to a real, in the analysis of Buddhist humanism, it is held that man should cultivates the three wholesome roots is non-greed (*alobha*), non-hatred (*adosa*) and non-illusion (*amoha*).

On the other hand, the mind of man is compared to a piece of gold ore, which is said to have the defilement of iron, copper, tin, lead and silver but when it is purified it shines with its natural luster, as when he attains the transcendent mind.[26] However, due to lack of knowledge and understanding, people may confuse between good and bad elements by the intense urge for sensuous gratification (*kāmacchanda*), maliciousness (*vyāpāda*), sloth and torpor (*thīnamiddha*), flurry and worry (*uddhaccakukkucca*) and doubt (*vicikicchā*). This is why precepts are necessary in the practice of moral discipline. They provide definite guidelines and help to avoid some of the confusion that empirical observation and social conventions may entail. *Kusala* culminates in the eradication of the defilements of mind (*kilesa*) by especially to the extinction of cankers (*āsavāna? khaya*),[27] to the destruction of cankers (*khīṇāsavā*),[28] to the free from cankers (*anāsava*).[29] The way for arising of the basic wholesome dispositions (*kusala*) is enumerated as the four base of mindfulness (*cattāro satipaṭṭhāna*),[30] the four modes of right endeavor (*cattāro-sammappadhāna*), the four bases of psychic power (*cattāro-iddhipādā*), the five faculties (*pañcindriyāni*), the five powers (*pañcabalāni*), the seven factors of enlightenment (*sattābojjhanga*) and the Eightfold Path (*ariyo atthangiko maggo*).[31]

It is said that the highest *kusala* state is the final freedom of mind and freedom thought wisdom, which one attains, by the elimination of all mental impurities. Throughout the *Pāli Nikāya* the restraint of mind is taught in many different ways viz. '*indriyesu guttadvāratā*' (guarding the doors of the sense organs), '*rakkhitamānasāno*' (protecting one's own mind), '*vijitindriyo*' (a man who has conquered his senses),

'danto santo niyato' (one whose mind is controlled, calmed and restrained), *'bhāvitam cittam'* (a mind which is trained), *'samvuto pātimokkhasmim'* (a man who has restrained himself by means of the rules of monks). Many other words of similar derivation and significance are used to express the virtue of self-restraint. The 'self-restraint' or 'self-control' holds an important position among the virtues of Buddhist humanism. This virtue is trained to limit evils may come into human mind. In the *Sekha Sutta*, it finds similar advice with *Gaṇaka-Moggallāna Sutta*: "Come you be of moral habit, live controlled by the control of the obligations, endowed with (right) behavior and pasture, seeing peril in the slightest faults and, undertaking them, train yourself in the rules of training."[32]

The education (*sikkha*) or development of Buddhist humanism did not have any distinction of caste, race, sex, etc. Man is declared in the 'Right' of equality, human rights, democracy and freedom. The Buddha used clause 'him I call a *Brāhmaṇa*' (holiness supreme) to extol anyone who does not do evil through body, speech or mind;[33] who exists not by matted hair, nor by family, nor by birth, but in both truth and righteousness;[34] who has cut off all fetters, not trembles, gone beyond ties, is unbound;[35] who is not wrathful, but is dutiful, virtuous, free from craving, self-controlled and bears his final body.[36] By encouraging people to look within their own mind, those help people take responsibility for themselves and their environments. It is hoped that if human beings can channel 'negative' emotions such as greed and anger in a positive direction, then the world peace movement has a prime starting point firmly grounded in the lives of people.

"With heart intent on speaking truth
On righteous ways and self-restraint
Curbing of sense and conduct pure,

On virtue's hearth and holy feast,
On open hand and gentle life,
Harming no creature, shunning force."[37]

Dhammapada also says that deed of harmlessness is called *Ariya* (noble) deed; one who is not harm living beings is called Noble man.[38] The thought *ahi?sā* (non-injure) is found in Buddhist humanism that can be described as the spirit of compassion (*karuṇā*) toward all living creatures. Without the aid of the war or violence, Buddhist humanism carries its message of peace and good will among the countries of the world through discourses of Four Noble Truth avoiding the suffering one own and other not only in physical harm, but also preclude mental harm.

Regarded as the root of the world's unhappiness it also refers to the passionate sense of egoism. For one thing, it makes the individual blind to the reality of other persons by the notion of 'self' disappears, the notion of 'mine' also disappears. When becoming free from the idea of 'I' and 'mine' (*ahaṃ-kāra mamaṃ-kāra*), one can finds a gentler, profounder sympathy with all sentient existence. Ken Jones, in his work says that terms Western culture 'egoist'; it magnifies and idealizes the very qualities of greed, violence (expressed hatred) and self-esteem (first-personalized delusion) that Buddhism considers its basic enemy.[39]

Naturally, Buddhist humanism does not praise a life of poverty and asceticism, nor does extol a low and bestial way of life of running after material sensual desires which reduce one into a weakling in body and a dullard in mentality. On the other hand, Buddhist humanism has great appreciation for mental joy and happiness, dedication to moral living, and an exultation of enlightened bliss and liberation. It advises people to return to their own true self, to their own true personality, and to a way of life in harmony with society. Harmony should be engendered between oneself and nature,

body and mind, compassion and wisdom, and feeling and intellect. Buddhist humanism affirms that all people are capable of achieving such a harmonious inner way if only one so desires and if one acts in accordance with Lord Buddha's teachings and in conformity with the Buddhist way of life of virtue and wisdom. It extols a way of life that avoids the two extremes of indulgence in vulgar, low sense desires and bodily mortification and asceticism - this is a way of life that leading to lasting joy and happiness. That is the most famous Eightfold way of life - a way that encompasses virtue, meditation and wisdom.

The terms of loving-kindness (*mettā*), compassion (*karuṇā*), sympathetic joy (*muditā*) and equanimity (*upekkhā*),[40] as well as patience (*khanti*), tolerance (*adhivāsanā*), humility (*nihatamāna*), contentment (*santuṭṭhi*), charity (*dayā*) and altruism is known as the important gospels for man's life, as well as the peaceful process of humankind. Warder notes that compassion and concern for the welfare of mankind as well of all living beings is frequently spoken of and recommended by the Buddha and his compassionate nature has been famous down the centuries.[41] Through these gospels are an invincible material force to change world of war and insecurity becoming a world of peace and happiness. The opinion is expressed that one should train himself thus: 'Neither will our minds become perverted, nor will we utter an evil speech, but kindly and compassionate will we dwell, with a mind of friendliness, void of hatred; and, beginning with him, we will dwell having suffused the whole world with a mind of friendliness that is far-reaching, wide-spread, immeasurable, without enmity, without malevolence.' This is how one must train himself.[42]

"To him who gives shall virtue be increased;
In him who curbs himself, no anger can arise;
The righteous man casts off all evil ways,

And by the rooting out of lust, and bitterness,
And all infatuation is at peace!"[43]

Under the light knowledge and wisdom, the attitude of peace, of compassion goes to its depth. It is beyond on the view of shortsighted; its concerning is only to remedy and remove the suffering of mankind. Such as in the *Abhayarājakumāra Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha spoke to Prince Abhaya, if boy owing to your carelessness or that of his nurse were to put a stick or stone into his mouth, what would you do for him? It is answered that he would get it out, if it was not able to get out at once, then taking hold of boy's head with his left hand, crooking a finger and his right hand would get it, even though it were with blood, because of his compassion for the boy.[44] Even so, it says that whatever speech the Buddha (*Tathāgata*) knows to be not fact (*ataccha*), not true (*abhūta*), not connected with the goal (*anatthasañhita*), and that is not liked by others (*appiya*), disagreeable (*amanāpa*) to them, that speech the Buddha does not utter. And whatever speech the Buddha knows to be fact, true, not connected with the goal, and is not liked by others, disagreeable to them; neither does the Buddha utter that speech. And whatever speech the Buddha knows to be fact, true, connected with the goal, but not liked by others, disagreeable to them, the Buddha is aware of the right time for explaining that speech. Whatever speech the Buddha knows to be not fact, not true, not connected with the goal, but is liked by others, agreeable to them, that speech the Buddha does not utter. Whatever speech the Buddha knows to be fact, true, not connected with the goal, yet liked by others, agreeable to them, neither does the Buddha utter that speech. And whatever speech the Buddha knows to be fact, true, connected with the goal, and liked by others, agreeable to them, the Buddha is aware of the right time for explaining that speech.[45]

In similar, for the sake of all living beings the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* advises, "One should not speak of such things seen, heard, thought and known, by saying which, unprofitable things increase and profitable things decrease. Contrarily, one should speak of such things-seen, heard, thought and known, by saying which, unprofitable things decrease and profitable things increase."[46] According to *Saṁyutta Nikāya* not everything was revealed and taught by the Buddha to his disciples, but only those things that he considered profitable, benevolent, useful and good for them. "Just so, much more in number is those things which I have found out, but not revealed. Only few are the things I have revealed. And why, have I not revealed them? Because they are not concerned with profit and do not conduce to the principles of holy life, to revulsion, to dispassion, to cessation, to tranquility, to full comprehension, to the perfect wisdom, to *Nibbāna*."[47] This is also the answer why the Buddha kept silence with metaphysical questions as "Eternal is the world, not eternal is the world, finite is the world, infinite is the world, life and body are the same, life and body are different, the *Tathāgata* exists after death, he exist not, he both exists and exists not, he neither exists nor exists not; also as to the sixty-two heretical views set forth in the *Brahmajāla* (*Sutta*), - owing to the existence of what, lord, do these views prevail: owing to the non-existence of what, lord, do these views not prevail?"[48]

THE OPINION OF EXPERIENCE

It is said that there are some opinion that causing the discussion among of Western scholars. The conflict of this opinion is found in the difference of the source of knowledge or epistemology. The Western philosophical tradition research for the indubitable foundation of all knowledge combined with the pursuit of a single paradigm to which all knowledge could conform through the object of sense-

experience. Meanwhile, Buddhist humanism considers reason as a function of the mind that the source of knowledge is mentioned not only including sense-experience but also concerning extrasensory experience. It emphasis 'knowing' (*jāna?*) must be based on 'seeing' (*passa?*) or direct perceptive experience, make a form of experience.

It is grounded that man is limited by the capabilities of his sense organs tending to perceive his limited experiences as absolute. Therefore with confidence man look into an empty room and say that there is nothing in the room though in fact the room is teeming with life forms that are so small that they cannot be seen by the naked eye. Similarly there are many sounds that man cannot hear. The universe as experienced by the wise is much larger, as they can, with their developed mind, tap into other sources of energy. Truth is absolute. However, what one perceives as Truth differs as it is limited by the capacity of his senses. The Buddha showed a path to develop one's sense organs so as to experience absolute Truth.

Knowledge of Buddhist humanism is had only as the phase of a gradual process of the salvation of discipline and concentration. It develops natural faculties of the mind that conducting to the cause and cessation of suffering. Buddha's enlightenment is not in a sudden act of intuition: 'I do not say that one can win the final knowledge at the very beginning; it is had from a gradual discipline, a gradual mode of action and conduct' (*nāhaṃ ādikeṅeva aññārādhanaṃ vadāmi api ca anupubbasikkhā anupubbakiriyā anupubbapaṭipadā aññārādhanā hoti*).[49]

The six extra sensory perception of *abhiññā* (special knowledge) is to become more importance in the process of recognition and attaining knowledge of emancipation. Paul Kurtz, perhaps the most prolific modern propagandist for humanism, has written: "One cannot find a doctrine of the

supernatural in Buddhism, at least as understood in religion."[50] However, in his lecture Victor A. Gunasekara states, "These relate in the main to 'supernatural' elements contained even in the earliest texts, and to some later popular developments relating to worship."[51]

On the subject of Rebirth and *Kamma* (action) that is mentioned in many place of the *Pāli Nikāya*[52] is discussed by students that it could be considered as belonging to the supernatural. Even though science has not as yet endorsed rebirth, which is a fundamental concept of Buddhist humanism, Rebirth and *Kamma* (action) is in keeping with the Law of Conservation of Mass and Energy. Science states that nothing is created or destroyed, and that there is only a transformation from one form to another. At death the body deteriorates and forms minerals, salts, fluids, gasses, etc. Should not this law then also apply to the rebirth of man? It is acknowledged that many scientists and doctors have accepted it as the only possible explanation for the many verifiable, documented incidence of persons who can remember their past lives through past-life regression. It sees some the name metaphysical thinking by scholars or thinkers as Saint Hoonen, founder of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism in the 12th-13th centuries gives expression to this prevailing sense of *kamma*-bound rebirth as the lot of all men: For the sin or merit of a former life, men may be born to good or evil in this fleeting world.[53] Suzuki Shoosan, 16th-17th century samurai turned Zen master in mid-life, speaks of 'the six forms of transmigration and the four types of birth,' and sees himself striving for enlightenment 'birth after birth.'[54] The late Yasutani Roshi, using modern terms, spoke as follows: Now in our subconscious are to be found the residual impressions of our life experiences including those of previous existences, going back to time immemorial.[55] And Abe Masao speaks of acting in "wisdom and compassion... operate to emancipate innumerable sentient beings from

transmigration."[56] Buddhasa P. Kirthisinghe states, "Man today is the result of millions of repetitions of thoughts and acts. He is not ready-made; he becomes and is still becoming. His character is pre-determined by his own choice. The thought, the act, which he chooses by habit, he becomes."[57] In her book 'Many Mansions', Dr. Gina Cerminara explores the past-life experiences of over one thousand persons given by Edgar Cacey, a Christian preacher, under self-hypnosis. Francis Story in his book Rebirth as Doctrine and Experience and Canadian-born Ian Stevenson in Twenty Cases Suggestive of Reincarnation methodically researches, verifies, and documents cases of persons who can remember their past lives in South-East Asia and other parts of the world. Rebirth is no longer a doctrine endorsed only by the East.

The other opinion of discussion is dealt with the existence of non-human beings. *Brahmajāla Sutta* of *Dīgha Nikāya* refers to various categories on non-human including of Thirty-One Planes of existence (*bhūmis*) divided into in the three categories, namely, the Sensual plane of existence (*kāma-bhūmi*), the Corporeal plane of existence (*rūpa-bhūmi* or *rūpa-brāhma*), and the Non-Corporeal plane of existence (*ārūpa-bhūmi* or *ārūpa-brāhma*).[58] The Sensual plane of existence (*kāma-bhūmi*) comprises the four *Apāya bhūmis*, the one *Manussa bhūmi*, and the *six Deva bhūmis*. The four *Apāya bhūmis* consist of *Niraya* (the realm of continuous intense suffering), *Tiracchāna* (the realm of animals), *Peta* (the realm of miserable and ever hungry beings), and *asura* (the realm of miserable and frightened). The *Manussa bhūmi* is the plane of human beings. The six *Deva bhūmis* consist of *Cātumahārājika* (the abode of the Four Guardian *Devas*), *Tāvatiṁsa* (the abode of the Thirty-three *Devas*), *Yāmā* (the abode of misery-freed *Devas*), *Tusita* (the abode of happy *Devas*), *Nimmānarati* (the abode of those *Devas* who rejoice in their own creations, and *Paranimmitavasavatti* (the abode

of those *Devas* who indulge in pleasures created to their liking by others).[59] It is according to the degree of feeling as the *Mahāsīhanāda Sutta*[60] of *Majjhima Nikāya* explains beings in heavenly spheres experience feelings which are exclusively pleasant (*ekantasukhā vedanā*) compared with the continued suffering which is sharp and severe (*ekantadukkhātippā kaṭukā*) of the beings of purgatory, suffering which is sharp and severe (*dukkā tippā kaṭukā*) of the beings of the animal world (*tiracchāna yoni*), feelings which are abundantly painful (*dukkhabahulā vedanā*) of the beings of the realm of the departed (*petas* or *pettivisaya*), and the experience of pleasure in general (*sukhabahulā vedanā*) of beings of the realm of human beings. Of these men has direct experience of only two, the human plane and the animal plane. The Corporeal plane of existence (*rūpa-bhūmi* or *rūpa-brāhma*) consists of sixteen planes. It is divided corresponding with the four degrees *jhāna* (meditation): First-*jhāna bhūmis* take account of three planes, namely, *Brahmapārisajjā* (Attendents of the Great *Bralmās*), *Brahmapurohitā* (Counsellors of the Great *Bralmās*) and *Mahābralmā* (Great *Brahmā*); Second-*jhāna bhūmis* comprises three planes, namely, *Parittābhā* (*Brahmās* of lesser radiance), *Appamāṇābhā* (*Brahmās* of limitless radiance), *Ābhassarā* (*Bralmās* of flashing radiance); Third-*jhāna bhūmis* contains of three planes, namely, Parittasubhā (*Brahmās* of lesser massive radiance), *Appamāṇasubhā* (*Bralmās* of limitless massive radiance), *Subhakiṇhā* (*Brahmās* of multi-hued glittering radiance); and fourth-*jhāna bhūmis* contains of seven planes, namely, *Vehapphalā* (*Bralmās* enjoying geat reward of *jhāna* practice), *Asaññasattā* (*Bralmās* devoid of consciousness), and five *Suddhāvāsa Bralmās bhūmis*, namely, *Avihā* (*Bralmās* whose position is durable), *Atappā* (Serene *Bralmās*), *Sudassā* (*Bralmās* of inspiring appearance), *Sudassi* (*Bralmās* of extremely pure appearance), and *Akaniṭṭhā* (Incomparable *Bralmās*). The Non-Corporeal plane of existence (*ārūpa-bhūmi* or *ārūpa-brāhma*) consists of

four planes, namely, *Ākāsānañcāyatana Brahmās bhūmis* (Space), *Viññāṇañcāyaṭana* (Infinity of Intellect), *Ākiñcaññāyatana Brahmās bhūmis* (Realm of Nothingness), and *Nevasaññānāsaññāyatana Brahmās bhūmis* (Neither Consciousness nor Not-Consciousness).[61] Rebirth in these heavens is the reward of great virtue accompanied with meditation,[62] or depending on the degree of faith and observance of the precepts.[63]

The existence of non-human beings in Buddhist humanism is expounded under the knowledge of clairvoyance (*dibbacakkhu*) or the paranormal ability of seeing the rebirth of beings after death (*cutūpapāta-ñāna*),[64] the retro-cognitive knowledge (*pubbenivāsānussatiñāṇa*). The knowledge of the destruction of defilements (*āsavakkha-yañāṇa*) is an important technical term in Buddhist psychology connoting the way which eradicates of the cankers and the introspective knowledge of one's liberated condition has mind, as well as the aspect of the fact of the extinction of all defilements of *saṃsāric* existence. In the *Saṅgārava Sutta* of *Majjhima Nikāya* the Buddha says, "If on being asked, 'Are there *devas*?' on should say: 'There are *devas*' and should say: 'Certainly they are known to me,' then the conclusion to be reached by an intelligent person is indubitable, namely that there are *devas*."[65]

In *Pāli Nikāya* the Gods (*devas*) are represented as visiting the Buddha, and asking him various questions in reply to which the Buddha will deliver a discourse or make a pithy comment. Buddhists humanism does not recommend praying or worshiping to Gods (*devas*) as Creator, Omniscience who of beginning and ending. The *Sa?yutta Nikāya* states that *Brahmā* Sahampati who God of the Realm of *Brahmā* becoming aware in thought of the thought of the Exacted One was this revealed: "Woe, woe! Now will the world perish! Woe! Now will the world utterly perish, in that the heart of the *Tathāgata, Arahant,* Buddha-Supreme

inclines to be averse from exertion and towards preaching the Norm!"[66] And thereafter *Brahmā* Sahampati joined hands towards the Exacted One and said: "Lord! Let the Exacted One preach the Norm! Let the Blessed One preach the Norm! There are souls whose eyes are hardly dimmed by dust (by lust, hate, and delusion); they are perishing from not hearing the Norm. They will come to be knowers of the Norm." It denotes in the verses:

"There hath appeared in Magadha before three
A Norm impure by minds unclean contrived
Unlock this door t' Ambrosia! Let them hearken
To Norm by Pure and Holy One revived.
As on a crag on crest of mountain standing
A man might watch the people far below,
E'en so do thou, o Wisdom fair, ascending,
O Seer of all, the terraced heights of truth,
Look down, from grief released, upon the nations
Sunken in grief, oppressed with birth and age.
Arise, thou Hero! Conqueror in the battle!
Thou freed from debt! Lord of the Caravan!
Walk the world o'er, (sublime and blessed Teacher!)
Teach us the Norm! There are, who'll understand."[67]

THE COURSE OF DEVELOPMENT

The question arises in Buddhist humanism that why does the Buddha attach special importance to *Nibbāna* or Mental Peace? It is explained that only the purifying of individual hearts and lives will effect genuine social change. Individuals who have been changed for the better through activity of body, speech and thought will only change the world for the better. The fully stated form of this is that only

when one is oneself fully enlightened. The *Dhammapada* says that one who is calm in body, calm in speech, calm in mind, who is well-composed, who has spewed out worldly things, is truly called a peaceful one.[68] Therefore, the course of development of Buddhist humanism is to build perfected man who destroyed all mental impurities (*akusala*) are described greed (*lobha*), malice or aversion (*dosa*) and ignorance or confusion (*moha*), who is freedom from duality implies the absence of any conflict (*dukkha*), who is called Enlightened One or Awakened One. If human mind still possesses of greed (*lobha*), malice or aversion (*dosa*) and ignorance or confusion (*moha*), his action from body, speech and though couldn't bring about welfare of many folk, happiness of many folk. The eleventh-twelfth century Tibetan monk Milarepa put it thus: One should not be over-anxious and hasty in setting out to serve others before one has oneself realized Truth in its fullness; to do so, would be like the blind leading the blind.[69]

The real Buddhist humanist is known in the term '*Arahant*,' one who destroyed rebirth, lived in chaste, (of a student) done is what had to be done, after this present life there is no beyond (*khiṇā jāti vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ kataṃ karaṇīyaṃ nāparaṃ itthattāya*),[70] who is said there arose in insight, the emancipation of my heart became unshaken able, this is last birth (*ñāṇañ ca pana me dassanaṃ udapādi akuppā me ceto-vimutti ayaṃ antimā jāti natthi dāni punabbhavo*).[71] Or term '*Bodhisatta*,' a being that aspires for *Bodhi* or Enlightenment.[72] According to *Jātaka* and the commentary of *Dhammapada*, the way to final Enlightenment of *Bodhisatta* is directed towards the practice of the perfections (*pāramitās*), namely, *dāna* (giving), *sīla* (moral temperament), *nekkhamma* (renunciation), *paññā* (wisdom), *vīriya* (endeavor), *khanti* (forbearance), *sacca* (truth), *adhiṭṭhāna* (resolute determination), *mettā* (loving), *upekhā* (equanimous).[73] The perfect practice of *dāna* (giving) is described in the attitude

of giving without calculating, comparing the advantages and disadvantages (of something) and selfish mind. It is seen in the expression of Pratt's words: "Be a protector of the unprotected, a guide to wayfarers, a ship, a dyke, and a bridge for them who seek the further. Shore, a lamp is for them who need a lamp, a bed for them who need a bed, a slave for them who need a slave."[74] And term *'Tathāgata'* who arises in the world, a perfected one, a fully Self-awakened One, endowed with right knowledge and conduct, well-farer, knower of the worlds, the matchless charioteer of men to be tamed, the Awakened One, the Lord.[75] The *Aṅguttara Nikāya* states, "there is one person whose birth into the world is for the welfare of many folk, for the happiness of many folk: who is born out compassion for the world, for the profit, welfare and happiness of *devas* and mankind. Who is that one person? It is a *Tathāgata* who is *Arahant*, a fully Enlightened One."[76]

As a real Buddhist humanist the pioneer in the attainment of supreme enlightenment (*pathamābhisambuddho*) the Buddha (*Tathāgata*) made the influence to change wrong comprehension of man and society. He showed the way of human training and emancipation from sufferings and declared equality, democracy and freedom for man. Prof. Niranjan Trivedi and Dr. Rajesh Jamindar say, "Lord Buddha was indeed the brightest star in the galaxy of reformers. He could see with his penetrating insight that there was a good deal that needed to be reformed in the old philosophical and ethical views."[77] However, it is said that although laying down a gradual training, a gradual doing, a gradual practice, some of them (men) attain perfect inner peace or *Nibbāna* but some do not. The Buddha said to *brahman* Gaṇaka-Moggallana what he can do for the latter if two people who want to go to the city, Rājagaha, approach and ask him the way leading to the city, it explain in detail how to get there and what they will pass on the way because he knows the

road to the city very well. One of them, having taken his words to heart, arrives at the city safe and sound but the other does not because taking a wrong way or else forgetting in aim, following other business. Like, the Buddha too can only show the way to practice to be free from suffering.[78] He always maintained that he is just who showed the moon had to see the moon. He could make everyone see through the direction of his finger.

Man is difficult to experience true bliss because he has emotions and crave for sensual gratification. So long as man lives this world of sensual pleasures he will never experiences true happiness. Of course it is true that man experiences some kind of happiness in life but it cannot be termed 'happiness' in the absolute sense of the word because it is not permanent. Man cannot gains bliss by harboring anger or hatred, selfishness or delusion. Occasionally, man does experience certain degrees of emotional satisfaction, but the nature of this happiness is lust like lightning, it is fleeting. It appears on a moment and it not appears the next. True bliss is not like this. If there is true bliss man will experience a permanent sense of calmness, satisfaction and tranquility. So the real purpose of one's lives should be to purify clouded, deluded, misled minds and free one's own from worries and disturbances. It seems that social-reformism overlooks the basic problem of mankind, that it is ruled by greed, hatred, and delusions about life and self—the basic three evils as seen by Buddhist humanism. As Kenneth Kraft, editor of Inner Peace, World Peace puts the view of many Buddhists about social reformism: "A reform that is pursued only from a socio-political standpoint they assert will at best provide (only) temporary solutions, and at the worst it will perpetuate the very ills it aims to cure."[79]

The education (*sikkha*) of Buddhist humanism directs towards the development (*bhavana*) of man's original capacity. The Buddha does not say man paying his respect

or looking for the salvation from Him. What he says, "You need to make an effect yourselves, for the Buddha only show you the way"[80] and "Be islands unto thyself, be refuges unto thyself, do not take another as your refuge."[81] Furthermore, the Exacted One advises man who wished to cross to the opposite bank should abide and utilizes by *Dhamma* as the boat, as the raft of wood or raft of basket-work. If a man to be tamed, first of all is of moral habit, controlled by the control of the obligations, behavior and pasture. Secondly, man should be guarded as to the doors of the sense organs and achieving control over the organ of mind. Thirdly, it is moderate in eating enough for maintaining this body, keeping the Brahma-faring by crushing out an old feeling and not allows a new feeling to arise. Fourthly, man should be dwelling intent on vigilance that cleansing the mind of obstructive mental states. Fifthly, the training of mindfulness and clear consciousness possessed of mindfulness as regards his every movement. Finally, man should be choosing a remote lodging in a forest, at the root of a tree, on a mountain slope, in a glen, a hill cave, a cemetery, a woodland grove, in the open, or on the heap of straw practice insight meditation to get rid of mental defilement.

So long as man can eradicate the root of ten mental defilements (*saṃyojanā*)[82] viz. personal ego-belief (*sakkāya-diṭṭhi*),[83] doubt (*vicikicchā*),[84] wrong conception of practice (*sīlabbata-parāmāsa*),[85] ill-will (*byāpāda*),[86] craving for material existence (*rūpa-rāga*),[87] craving for non-material existence (*arūpa-rāga*),[88] conceit (*māna*),[89] restlessness (*uddhacca*)[90] and illusion (*avijjā*)[91] is known attaining *Nibbāna* or perfect inner peace, which is the ultimate goal of Buddhist humanism, complete emancipation and supreme bliss through the four stages, which is described as entering the stream of saint. In that stream of saint it cannot find the subtle remnant of the 'I am' conceit, of the 'I am' desire, of the lurking tendency to think 'I am' is utterly removed.[92]

It said that what man needs for his happiness is not a religion or a mass of theories but an understanding of the cosmic nature of the Universe, of the *Dhamma*. Until this fact is not fully understood, life and existence of man will remain imperfect and faulty. Man cannot hope Gods, Mohammad, Jesus, or Buddha, as well as logical reasoning or scientific investigation to get rid of greed, anger and delusion in one's own or in the world. His only hope lies in going along the road of purity and wisdom in the eightfold development of *sīla* (conduct), *samādhi* (concentration) and *paññña* (wisdom) clearly defined by the Buddha. The followers of the Eightfold Path will at their respective paces advance towards *Arahatship* (saint-ship) which "the complete destruction of the Three Bonds (the Delusions of self, Doubt, and Trust in the efficacy of good works and ceremonies) becomes a converted man, one who cannot be reborn in any state of woe, and is assured of attaining to the Insight of the stages higher (*sambodhi-parāyano*) The destruction of the Deadly Floods (or Intoxications-Lusts Becomings, Delusion, and Ignorance) has, by himself, known and realized and continues to abide here, in this visible world, in that emancipation of mind, that emancipation of heart."[93]

Through insistence on the interrelatedness of knowledge, caring for all existence, equality in social structure, teachings of ethic for all beings, and attitude to peace, Buddhist humanism shows the Middle Way for each individual and society at large, to live in harmony with one another and with nature. Further, Buddhist humanism opens the door of *Nibbāna* to anyone who wishes looking for highest bliss, emancipation, and mental peace.

Human values are asserted in Buddhist humanism that they are endowed with power or potentialities to involve their own destiny without depend on the hand of Gods or Deity. Humphreys writes, "...It points to man and man alone

as the creator of his own life and sole designer of his destiny."[94] In this respect, man's position is supreme; he is his own master and there is no other being or power higher than himself judging over his destiny; his success or failure lies in his own will, choice and strength. "To become a friend, an intimate of that which is good and righteous...you yourself must take into your life diligence in good things."[95] He is aware of an inner motivation to act or not to act, he lives with others; each is a chooser, existing according to his own choice-a choice for the improvement of humanity.

It is clearly that Buddhist humanism is not essentially the same from view of all religious humanism as some scholars or thinkers have mentioned. In fact, Buddhist humanism is not so care to the field of religion or non-religion that its interestingness is the preservation of supreme value of more properly human conditions, not only because of life itself but also because of the fact that human welfare, material, moral and spiritual, and even final emancipation are gained from it and in it.

References

1. D. II, p. 100; III, p. 58; S. III, p. 42; V, p. 163.
2. D.R. Jatava, *'The Humanism of Buddha'*, New Delhi (1998), p.11.
3. M. I, p. 69; S. II, pp. 217, 222.
4. S. V, p. 127.
5. A. III, p. 16-17.
6. Sn. v. 839
7. M. II, p. 44.
8. M. I, p. 37.
9. S. II, p. 17.
10. Edward Conze (ed.), *'Buddhist Scriptures'*, Penguin Books, Reprinted (1969), pp. 146-162.
11. A. II, p. 52.
12. Vidya Bhushan and D.R. Sachdeva, *'An Introduction to Sociology'*, Kitab Bahal, 43th Edition, 2002, pp. 380-381.
13. M. II, p. 222; cf. A. I, pp. 173-175.

14. D. I, p. 53; DA. I, p. 161.
15. D. I, p. 55.
16. D. III, p. 106.
17. Jacobson, N.P., '*Buddhism*', London: Allen (1996), p. 27.
18. D. I, p. 18.
19. A. I, p. 173 f.
20. Dhp.v. 165.
21. D. II, pp. 81, 84, 91, 94, 98, 123, 126; A. I, pp. 165 sq., 196; II, p. 211; III, pp. 93, 414; IV, p. 79; Ps. I, pp. 94, 117; Dhs. p.1099, 1448; Nd. II, p. 134: cf. the set of three, which is probably older (kāma-, bhava-, avijjā-) occurs at M.I, p. 55; A. I, p165; III, p 414; S. IV, p. 256; V. 56, 189; Iti. p. 49.
22. Dhs. part. 1229; Vism. p. 683; See Ps. I, p. 130.
23. S. II, p. 17; III, pp. 10,135, 161.
24. S. IV, p. 205; M. III, p. 285.
25. D. III, pp. 254, 282; S. V, p. 60; A. IV, p. 9.
26. A. V, p. 91.
27. D. I, p. 151; S. II, pp. 29, 214; III, pp. 57, 96 sq, 152 sq; IV, pp. 105, 175; V, p. 92, 203, 220, 271, 284; A.I, pp.107 sq., 123 sq., 232 sq., 273, 291; II, pp.6, 36, 44 sq., etc.
28. S. I, pp.13, 48, 53; II, pp.83, 239; III, pp. 128, 178; IV, p. 217; A.I, pp.77, 109, etc.
29. D. III, p. 112; S. I, 130; II, p. 214, 222; III, p. 83; IV, p. 128; A.I, p. 81, 187, etc.
30. S. V, pp. 145, 166-189.
31. D. III, p. 102.
32. M. I, p. 355.
33. Dhp.v. 391.
34. Dhp.v. 393.
35. Dhp.v. 397.
36. Dhp.v. 400.
37. D. III, p. 147.
38. Dhp. v. 270.
39. Ken Jones, '*The Social Face of Buddhism: An Approach to Political and Social Activism*', London: Wisdom Publications, (1989), p.
40. D. III, pp. 196, 220.
41. A.K. Warder, '*Indian Buddhism*', p. 64.
42. M. I, pp. 128-129.
43. D. II, p. 135.
44. M. I, p. 395.

45. M. I, p. 395.
46. A. II, p. 173 f.
47. S. V, p. 437.
48. S. IV, p. 286.
49. M. I, pp. 479-480.
50. Paul Kurtz Eupraxophy, *'Living without Religion'*, Prometheus Books (1989), p. 70.
51. Victor A.Gunasekara, *'A Comparison of the Doctrines of Humanism and Buddhism Considering their Similarities and Differences,'* see http//:www.google.com, s.v. *Humanism.*
52. D. III, p. 31;M. I, p. 401
53. Hoonen, *'The Buddhist Saint: His Life and Teaching'*, Translated by Harper H. Coates and Ryugaku Ishizuka Kyoto: Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World (l949), p. 430.
54. Winston L. King, *'Death was his Kooan: The Samurai Zen of Suzuki Shoosan'*, Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press (1986), pp. 195, 370.
55. Philip Kapleau, *'The Three Pillars of Zen: Teaching, Practice, Enlightenment'*, Tokyo: John Weatherhill (1965), p. 101.
56. E.O.R, ed. by Frederick J. Streng, Vol. X, s.v. *'Nāgārjuna'*, New York: Macmillan and Free Press (1987), p. 293.
57. Buddhasa P. Kirthisinghe *'Buddhism and Science: Karma, Rebirth and Genetics'*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (1984), p. 81.
58. D. III, p. 215
59. D. III, p. 264; Pv. IV, p. 11; There are five realms of *niraya, tiracchānayoni, pettivisaya, manussā, devā* (absence of *asura*) is found in M. I, p.73 f.; D. III, p. 234; A. IV, p. 459; Nd. II, 550.
60. M. I, p. 73 f.
61. Vism. p.415; KhA. p. 121
62. A. I, p. 227 sq.
63. D.III, p. 112; S.I, pp. 141, 155, 282; A.III, p. 332, IV, pp. 75,103; Sn. vv. 508, 1117.
64. Cf. M. I, p. 296; A. V, p. 3.
65. M. II, pp. 212-213.
66. S. I, p. 136.
67. S. I, p. 137.
68. Dhp. v. 378.
69. Ken Jones, *'The Social Face of Buddhism: An Approach to Political and Social Activism'*, London: Wisdom Publications (1989), p. 202.
70. D. I, pp. 84, 177, 203; M.I, p. 139; II, p. 39; S. I, p. 140; II, pp. 51, 82, 95, 120, 245; III, pp. 21, 45, 71, 90; IV, p. 20, 35, 151; V, pp.72, 90; A.I, p. 165; II, p.211, etc.

71. S. II, p. 171; III, p. 28; IV, p. 8; V, p. 204; A.I, p. 259; IV, pp. 56, 305, 448.
72. M. I, p. 17, 163, 240; S. II, p. 5; III, 27; IV, p. 233; V, pp.263, 281, 317; A. II, p.130.
73. J. I, p. 73; DhpA. I, p. 84.
74. J. B. Pratt, *'The Pilgrimage of Buddhism'*, New York: Macmillan (1928), pp. 219-220.
75. M. I, pp. 178-179.
76. A. I, p. 20.
77. Prof. Niranjan Trivedi & Dr. Rajesh Jamindar, *'Perspectives on Buddhist Ethics: The basis of Buddhist Ethics as Reflected in Pārājika Rules of Pātimokkha'*, p. 27.
78. M. III, pp. 1 ff.
79. Kenneth Kraft, ed., *'Inner Peace, World Peace'*, Albany: State University Press of New York (1992), p. 12.
80. Dhp. v. 276.
81. D. II, p. 100.
82. Nd. I. p. 80; Nd. II. p. 505.
83. M. I, p. 300; III, p. 17; S. III, p. 16 sq.
84. D. I, p. 246; III, pp. 49, 216, 234, 269; S.I, p. 99; III, p.106 sq.; A. III, pp. 292, 438; IV, p. 68, 144 sq.; V, p. 144, etc.
85. M. I, p. 433; A. III, p. 377; IV, p. 144 sq; Nd. I. p. 98; Dhs. p. 1005
86. S. I, p. 99; Nd. I. pp. 149, 207, 386; M.I, p. 434; Iti. p. 119.
87. D. III, p. 234.
88. Ibid.
89. D. III, p. 234; S. I, p. 4; Sn. vv. 132, 370, 469, 537, etc
90. A. I, p. 256, 282; III, p. 375, 421, 449; IV, p. 87; V, p. 142, 145, 148; D. III, 234; S. V, p. 277 sq., etc.
91. D. I, p. 84; III, p.216; Iti. p. 49.
92. S. III, 131; cp. S. II, 53.
93. D. I, p. 156.
94. C. Humphers, *'Buddhism'*, p. 76.
95. S. I, p. 75.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

(Textual *Pāli* sources and their English translation)

Abhidhammathasangaha: Ed. by Hammalawa Saddhatissa, Oxford: PTS, 1989.

Aṅguttara Nikāya: Ed. R. Morris & E. Hardy, 5 Vols. London: PTS, 1885-1900. Tr. F.L. Woodward, Vols. II &I; E.M. Hare, Vols. III& IV: **The Book of the Gradual Sayings.** London: PTS, 1955- 1970.

Buddhavamsa and Cariyāpitaka: Ed. N.A. Jayawickrama. London: PTS, 1974. First tr. by Dr. (SMT.) M.V. Talim: **The Genealogy of the Buddhas (Buddhavamsa)**. Bombay: Bombay University Press, 1969. Second tr. I.B. Horner: **Chronicle of Buddhas (Buddhavamsa)** and **Basket of Conduct (Cariyāpitaka)**. London: PTS, 1975.

Dhammapada: A Reprint of the Burma *Piṭaka* Association Publication. Tr. Daw Mya Tin: **The Dhammapada - Verses and Stories.** Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi, 1990.

Dhammasagaṅganī Aṭṭhakathā or AtthasāLinī: (PTS) Ed. by E. Muller, 1897.

Dīgha Nikāya: Ed. T.W. Rhys Davids & J.E. Carpenter, 3 Vols. London: PTS, 1890-1911. Tr. by T.W. & C.A.I. Rhys Davids: **The Dialogues of the Buddha**, 3 Vols. London: PTS, 1899, 1910 & 1957 respectively (reprints).

Itivuttāka: Ed. E. Windisch, London: Pts, 1975. Tr. F.L. Woodward: **As It Was Said**. London: PTS, 1985.

Jātaka: Ed. V. Fausbell. 6 vols. London: PTS, 1962. Tr. By various hands. Ed. Prof. E.B. Cowell: **The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births**, 3 Vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass Publishers, 1990.

Khuddhakapātha: Ed. Helmer Smith, London: PTS, 1978. Tr. Bhikkhu ǎṇamoli: **The Minor Readings**. And Tr. of its commentary: **The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning** (*Paramatthajātikā*). London: PTS, 1960.

Majjhima Nikāya: Ed. V. Trenckner &R. Chelmers, 3 Vols. London: PTS, 1888-1896. Tr. by I. B. Horner: **The Collection of Middle Length Sayings,** 3 Vols. London: PTS, 1954-1959.

Niddesa: Mahāniddesa ed. L. De La Vallee Poussin & E.J. Thomas. London: PTS, 1916, 1917, and 1978. Cullaniddiesa ed. W. Stede. London: PTS, 1918, 1988. Not yet translated.

Patisambhidāmagga: Ed. Arnord C Taylor, vols. I, II. London: PTS, 1905, 1907, and 1979. Tr. by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli: **The Path of Discrimination**. London: PTS, 1982.

Paṭsambhidāmagga: Ed. by A.C. Taylor, Vols. I, II (PTS), 1905, 1907.

Saṁyutta Nikāya: Ed. M.L. Feer, 5 Vols. London: PTS, 1884-1991. Tr. by C.A.F. Rhys Davids and S.S. Thera, Vol. I; C.A.F. Rhys Davids & Fit Woodward, vol. II; F.L. Woodward Vol. III-V: **The Book of the Kindred Sayings**. London: PTS, 1950-1956.

Sutta-Nipāta: Ed. Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith: PTS, 1965. Tr. K.R. Norman: **The Group of Discourses** (revised Tr. 1992). London: PTS, 1984.

Theragāthā: Ed. Hermann Oldenberg & Richard Pischel. London: PTS, 1966. First Tr. by Mrs Rhys Davids: **Psalms of the Early Buddhists-Psalms of the Brethren**. London:

PTS, 1951. Second Tr. by K.R. Norman: The Elder's Verses. London: PTS, 1969.

Therigāthā: Ed. (together with The Theragāthā). Tr. Mrs. Rhys Davids: **Psalms of the Early Buddhists-Psalms of the Sisters**. London: PTS, 1948.

Udāna: Pts. Tr. by F.L. Woodward: **Verses of Uplift**. London: PTS, 1985.

Vimānavatthu-Petavatthu: Ed. N.A. Jayawickrama: Sri Lanka, 1973-1974. Tr. by Jean Kennedy & Henry S. Gehman: **Stories of the Mansions and Stories of the Departed** (The Minor Anthologies of the *Pāli* Canon, part IV). London: PTS, 1942.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Vietnamese

Most Ven. Thich Minh Chau: Translation of:

Dīgha Nikāya: **Truong Bo Kinh**, 2 vol.

Majjhima Nikāya: **Trung Bo Kinh**, 3 vols.

Samyutta Nikāya: **Tuong Ung Bo Kinh**, 5 vols.

Aṅguttara Nikāya: **Tang Chi Bo Kinh**, 3 vol.

T.P. Ho-Chi-Minh: Vien nghien Cuu Phat Hoc Viet Nam's publication.

Ven. Thich Chon Thien: Phat Hoc Khai Luan. T.P. Ho-Chi-Minh; G.H.P.G.V.N., Ban Giao Duc Tang Ni, 1993.

English

Ambedkar, B. R.: **The Buddha and His Dhamma**. Bombay: Siddharth College Publication, 1957.

Banerjee, N.V.: **Buddhism and Marxism: A study in Humanism**. Orient Longman Ltd., 1978.

Baker, E.: **Principles of Social and Political Theory**, Oxford, 1962.

Barker, E.: **Social Contract**. London: Oxford University Press, and Reprint 1948.

Bapat, P.V.: **2500 Years of Buddhism**. Delhi: Publication Division, 1964.

Bareau, A.: **La date du Nirvāṇa**, JA, 1953.

Barua, Dipak Kumar : **An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas**. Calcutta, Rabindra Bharti University, 1971.

Basak, Radhagovinda (Ed.): Asokan Inscriptions. Calcutta, Progressive, 1959.

Basu, P. (2nd Ed.): **Indo-Aryan Polity**, London, 1925.

Bhattacharya, V: **The Basic Conception of Buddhism**, University of Calcutta, 1934.

Bougle, Celestin: **Essays on the Caste System**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Buddhasa P.K.: **Buddhism and Science: Karma, Rebirth and Genetics**, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

Chalmers (Ed.): **Harvard Oriental Series**, Vol. 37, London: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Chattopadhyaya, D.P.: **Lokāyata**, Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1973.

Conze, E.: **Buddhist Thought in India**, 1962.

Condorcet: **Esquisse d'um Tableau Historique des Progress de l' Espirit Humain**, 1793.

Dalai Lama, H.H. XIV: **Non-governmental Organizations United Nations World Conference on Human Rights**, The lecture in 15 June 1993 Vienna, Austria.

Dalai Lama, H.H. XIV: **Universal responsibility and the good heart**, Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan works, 1976.

Damien V. Keown, Charles S. Prebish, Wayne R. Husted,

(Ed.): **Buddhism and Human Rights**, Curzon Press, 1998.

Davies, Tony: **Humanism**. London: Routledge, 1997.

Dhammaratana, U.: **Buddha and Caste System**, Balprapur: Bes, 1969.

Dutta, N.: **Early Monastic Buddhism**, Vol. I, II, Calcutta: C.O. Book Agency, Panchanan Ghose Lane, 1941-1945.

Edward Conze (ed.): **Buddhist Scriptures**, Penguin Books, and Reprinted, 1969.

Ehrenfeld, David: **Arrogance of Humanism**. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Elliot, Charles: **Hinduism and Buddhism**, Vol. I. London: Edward Arnold, 1921, 1962; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.

Flick, R.: **The Social Organization of North - East India in Buddha's Time**, Calcutta, University of Calcutta, 1920.

Fromm, Erich F.R.: **The Courage to be Human**. Tr. Michael Show: New York: Continuum, 1982.

Gabriel Marcel: **Existentialism Background of Human Dignity**, Harvard, 1963.

Geiger, Wilhm: **Pāli Literature and Language**. Tr. Batakrishna Ghosh. Delhi: Orental Book reprint Corporation, 1978.

Gunasekara, V. A.: **The Buddhist Attitude to God**. Statement made to a Multi-religious Seminar First Published: February 1993, Second Edition: April 1997.

Haldane, Viscount: **Philosophy of Humanism**, London, 1922.

Hoonen: **The Buddhist Saint: His Life and Teaching**, Tr. by Harper H. Coates and Ryugaku Ishizuka Kyoto. Publication of Sacred Books of the World, 1949.

Horner, (Miss) I.B.: **Women under Primitive Buddhism,** London, 1930.

Hume, David: **A treatise of Human Nature**, Book I, Part IV, Sec. 6. Hamden Archon Book, 1965.

Humphreys, Christmas: **Buddhism**. London: Buddhist Society, 1956.

Huxley, Julian (Ed.): **Humanist Frame** (Introduction), London: George Allen & Union Ltd. 1961.

Inada, Kenneth K.: **The Buddhist Perspective on Human Rights** and **Human Rights in Religious Traditions**, New York: Pilgrim Press, 1982.

Indr, S.B.: **The Social Philosophy of Buddhism**, Bangkok, 1979.

Jacobson, N.P.: **Buddhism**, London: Allen, 1996.

James William: **Meaning of Truth**, New York: Longman's Green and Co., 1914.

Jatava, D.R.: **The Dimensions of Humanism**. India: Phoenix Publishing House Jagdishpura Lohamandi Agra, 1970.

Jatava, D.R.: **The Humanism of Buddha**, Jaipur, 1998.

Jayasuriya, W.F.: **The Psychology and Philosophy of Buddhism**, Colombo, 1963.

Jayaswal, K.P.: **Hindu Polity**, Calcutta, 1934.

Jayatilake, K.N.: **Buddhist View On Society, Law and Human Rights** (Sihalese Edition). Buddhist Publication Society: Kandy, Sri Lanka, 1970.

Jayatilleke, K.N.: **Dhamma, man and law**, Singapore: The Buddhist research society, 1992

Jayatilleke, K.N.: **Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge**. London: Allen and Unwin, 1963.

Jayatilleke, K.N.: **Ethics in Buddhist Perspective**, Buddhist Publication Society, Kandy, 1962.

Jayatilleke, K.N.: **The Message of the Buddha**, a posthumous work, Ed. by Ninian Smart, London, 1975.

Jayatilleke, K.N.: **The Principles of International Law in Buddhist Doctrine**, Extract from the 'Recuil des Cours', Vol. II, (Private Circulation only), Leiden, 1967.

John Mackenzie, S.: **A manual of Ethics**, London, 1929.

John Muirhead, H.: **The Elements of Ethics**, London, 1910.

Julkraya: **Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism**: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Kalupaḥana, David, J.: **Language, Truth and Culture in Buddhist Perspective**, a lecture delivered at the East-West Philosopher's Conference. Honolulu, 1989.

Keith, A.B.: **Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon**, Oxford, 1923.

Ken Jones: **The Social Face of Buddhism: An Approach to Political and Social Activism**, London: Wisdom Publications, 1989.

Kenneth Kraft (Ed.): **Inner Peace, World Peace**, Albany: State University Press of New York, 1992.

Kern, H.: **Manual of Indian Buddhism**, Strassburg, 1896.

Krishnanand: **Humanism or the Human Religion**. Jaivalamukhi: Vishwa Seval Angha, 1940.

Lafleur, William. R.: **Buddhism in Literature, Karma of Words Buddhism and Literary, Arts in Dediaval Japan**. Berleley: University of California Press, 1983.

Lamotte, Etienne: **History of Indian Buddhism**, tr. Sara Webb-Boin, 1988.

Lamont, Corliss: **The Philosophy of Humanism**, New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1965.

Lay, U KO: **Guide to Tipitaka**, ed. by The Editirial Committee. India: Sri Satguru Publication, 1990.

Law, Bimala Churn: **A History of Pāli Literature**, vols I, II. Delhi: Golyal Offset Printers, 1983.

Mackenzie, J.S.: **Lectures on Humanism**, London, 1907.

Mahesh Tiwary (Ed.): **Perspectives on Buddhist Ethics**, Delhi University, 1989.

Malalasekera G.P.: **Philosophical Implications of the Pañcasīla**, Sambhāshā, 1991.

Malalasekera, G.P. and Jayatilleke, K.N.: **Buddhism and the Race Question**, UNESCO, 1958.

Marcel Gabriel: **The Existential Background of Human Dignity**. Harvard, 1963.

Maritain, Jacques: **True Humanism**. Tr. By M. R. ADASON. Greenwood Press Publishers WestPoint Connecticut, 1970.

Max Muller, F. (Ed.): **The Sacred Books of the East: Dhammapada**, Vol. X, part II. Reprinted by Motilal Banarasidass, 1881, 1864, 1988 and 1992.

Marx, Karl: **Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844**. Tr. Martin Milligan. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1970.

Marx And Engels: **On Religion Moscow**. Progess Publishers, 1976.

Max Muller F. (Ed.): **Sacred Books of The East: Dhammapada**, tr. by F. Max Muller. First Published by the Oxford University Press, 1881, Reprinted by Motilal Banarsidass, 1965, 1968, 1973, 1977, 1980, 1988, 1992, and 1998.

Mookerji, R.K.: **Hindu Civilization**. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1950.

Moore, G. E.: **Principia Ethica**, Cambridge University Press, and Reprint 1954.

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu: **The Path of Purification**, Colombo: R. Semage, 1956.

NāRada, Thera (Tr.): **The Dhammapada**, London, John Murray, 1954. Calcutta Mahabodhi Book Agency, 1970. Reprint Colombo, 1972.

Nandasena Ratnapala: **Buddhist Sociology**, Delhi, 1993.

Novak, George: **Humanism and Socialism**. New York: Pathfinders Press, 1973.

Oldenberg, H.: **The Buddha: His Life, His Doctrine, His Order**, Williams and Norgate, 1882.

Pande, Govind Chandra: **Studies in the Origins of Buddhism**. Reprinted Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1974.

Pathak, M.N.: **Human life and the Teaching of Buddha**, New Delhi: Antique Publications, 1988.

Paul K.E.: **Living without Religion**. Prometheus Books, 1989.

Perera, L.P.N.: **A Buddhist Commentary on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**, Colombo: Karunaratne and Sons, 1991.

Petrosyan, M.: **Humanism**, Moscow: Progress Publishers Press, 1972.

Phaharaj, D.M.: **Humanism in Contemporary India Philosophical Perspectives**. Merrut Anu Book Published, 1995.

Philip Kapleau: **The Three Pillars of Zen: Teaching, Practice, Enlightenment**, Tokyo: John Weatherhill, 1965.

Poussin, De La Vallee: **Bouddhisme**, Third Edition, 1925.

Poussin, De La Vallee: **The way of Nirvana**, Six lectures on ancient Buddhism as a Discipline of Salvation (Hibbert Lectures, 1916). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917.

Pratt, J.B.: **The Pilgrimage of Buddhism**. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Radhakrishnan, S.: **An Idealist View of Life**. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1984.

Radhakrishnan, S: **Indian Philosophy**, Vol. I, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1929.

Rahula, Walpola: **The Heritage of the Bhikkhu**. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1974.

Rahula, Walpola: **What the Buddha Taught**. Gordon Fraser, 1959.

Rahula, Walpola: **Zen and the taming of the bull: Essays.** Gordon Fraser, 1978.

Rhys David, C.A.F.: **The Birth of Indian Psychology and Its Development in Buddhist,** London: Luzac and Co., 1936.

Rhys Davids, C.A.F: **Manual of Buddhism for advanced Students**, London: Macmillan, 1932. New Delhi, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1978.

Rhys Davids, T.W.: **Buddhist India**, Calcutta, 1955.

Rhys Davids, T.W.: **Indian Buddhism**. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publication, 1993.

Rhys David, T.W.: **The History and Literature of Buddhism.** Susil Gupta (India): Private Ltd. 22/3-C Galiff Street Calcutta-4, reprint, 1962.

Rhys David, T.W.: **The Questions of King Milinda**, Book III, Oxford, 1963.

Romilla Thapar: **A History of India**, Vol. I, Penguin Books, Reprint 1969.

Saddhatissa, H.: **Essence of Buddhism**, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1970.

Satre, Jean Paul: **Existentialism and Humanism**. Tr. by Philip Mairet. London: Methuen, 1949.

Senart, E.: **Caste in India**, London: Methuen, 1930.

Sengupta, P.C: **Ancient Indian Chronology**, Calcutta, 1947

Sidgwick, H.: **The Method of Ethics**, London, 1874.

Singh, Balbir: **Dhamma: Man, Religion and Society**. Delhi: Amold - Heinemann, 1981.

Singh, I.N.: **Philosophy of Universal Flux in Theravada Buddhism**, Delhi: Brahpuri, 2002.

Singh, Jai Deep: **The Humanistic View of Man**, New Delhi: Indraprastha, 1979.

Singh, Wazir: **Humanism of Guru Nanak: A Philosophical Inquiry**. Delhi: ESS Publication, 1977.

Tachibana, S.: **The Ethics of Buddhism**, Colombo, 1943.

Tatia: **Studies in Jaina Philosophy,** Banaras, Jain Cultural Society, 1951.

Terdinand Canning Scott Schiller: **Studies in Humanism**. Book for libraries Press Freeport. New York: Reprint, 1969.

Thomas, E.J.: **The life of Buddha**, London, 1956.

Todorsky, Y.: **Democracy in Action**, Soviet Military Review, 1976.

Tood, Marge: **Christian Humanism and the Pritan Social Order**. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Trevor Ling: **The Buddha**, Penguin books, 1976.

Varma, W.P.: **Philosophical Humanism and Contemporary India**. Dellhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979.

Vidya Bhushan and Sachdeva, D.R. **An Introduction to Sociology**, Kitab Bahal, 43th Edition, 2002.

Warder, A.K.: **Indian Buddhism**. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publication, 1970, 1980, and 1991.

Weber, Max: **The Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism**, Chicago, 1958.

Wijesekera, O.H. DE A.: **Buddhism and Society**, Colombo, 1952.

Winternitz, Maurice: **A History of Indian Literature**, vols I, II. Delhi: Shantilal Jain at Shri Jainendra Press, 1983.

Dictionaries

Buddhadata MahāThera, A.P.: **English-Pāli Dictionary**. London (1955); Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Reprint 1989, 1997. And some others.

David, Rhys & William, Stede: **Pāli-English Dictionary**. London: PTS, 1972.

Malalasekara, G.P.: **Dictionary of Pali Proper Name**, Vol. II, London: PTS, 1960.

Odhams: **Dictionary of the English Language Illustrated**, Odhams Ltd, 1946.

Runes, D.D. (Ed.): **Dictionary of Philosopher**, New York, 1942.

Encyclopaedia

Edwards, P. (Ed.): **Encyclopedia of Philosophy**, Vol. IV, New York, 1967.

Frederick J. Streng (Ed.): **The Encyclopedia of Religion**, Vol. X, New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1987. And some other.

Hastings, James (Ed.): **Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics**, Vol. IV, X, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1967.

Malalasekera, G.P. (Ed.) and others: **Encyclopedia of Buddhism**, vol. I-V. Sri Lanka: The Department of Government Printing, 1961-1990.

Philip W. Goetz (Ed.) and others: **Encyclopedia Britannica**, Vol. VI, Chicago: 1768, Reprint 1990.

Scott Fetzer (Ed.): **The World Book Encyclopedia**, Vol. IX, Chicago, 1992.

Singh, Nagendra Kumar (Ed.): **International Encyclopedia of Buddhism** Vol. II, Tr. by Moffatt, 1996.

Bhikkhu Duc Truong alias Tran Thanh Chủong has devoted himself to monastic life since 1988. He took his B.A from the Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies, Ho Chi Minh City, in Viet Nam in 1997. He got his M.A in 1999 and obtained his doctorate on *Humanism in the Nikāya Literature* from University of Delhi in 2003.

Please mail your order to :

Eastern Book Linkers

(INDOLOGICAL PUBLISHERS & BOOKSELLERS)

5825, New Chandrawal, Jawahar Nagar,

Delhi - 110007, Ph : 23850287, 30919869

e-mail : ebl@vsnl.net

ISBN 81-7854-065-7